

the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8206. Also, petition of Rose E. Wilson, of Riverside, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8207. Also, petition of Maurice J. Hyde, of Oakland, Calif., and 14 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8208. Also, petition of J. C. Stein, of Del Mar, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8209. Also, petition of H. M. Brinker, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 21 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8210. Also, petition of T. J. Conlin, of Venice, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8211. Also, petition of Harry H. Schiffler, of Covina, Calif., and 10 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8212. Also, petition of Bert J. Egan, of Long Beach, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8213. Also, petition of W. N. Dennison, of Sterling, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for the Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of the constitutional money power, and requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou art a God of wisdom and might, yet of infinite love and tenderness, so that we may fittingly call

Thee our Heavenly Father. Thou art the creator of the far-flung universe, of which this planet we call the earth is only a very small part. Yet here, living upon it, are human beings with qualities akin to Thine and able in some measure to understand Thy ways and have personal fellowship with Thee. For all these gifts and graces, as well as Thy constant care, accept today our grateful thanks.

Yet men, born for brotherhood in Thy great family, have broken that fellowship, and, in a spirit of selfishness and ill-will, are again in the midst of a great war. Forgive them for what they are doing, and forgive us for any spirit of hatred and unbrotherliness which may be in our hearts. Out of this wrong ambition and dependence upon force of arms bring even yet some good. Give Thy sympathy and comfort to bleeding hearts and shattered lives everywhere, and help us to minister to their needs.

Thy blessing we seek upon our own land, upon the President, the Vice President, the Members of this Senate, and other leaders of the Nation. May they continue to pray and work for peace even in these dark and tragic days. Grant that America may be the instrument in Thy hands for aiding men to see a better way of living together in amity and good will. Use us, each and all, high and low, for the beneficent purposes of Thy kingdom, the reign of justice and righteousness, of peace and friendship over the world.

All this we ask in the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, May 9, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6965) for the relief of Stina Anderson.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1937, to provide for participation in the New York World's Fair, 1940, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 6264. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6965. An act for the relief of Stina Anderson;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Greenwich, Conn., as a town;

H. R. 8319. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to suspend section 510 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, during the present European war, and for other purposes.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Blibo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Eridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## GOLDEN GATE EXPOSITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That in order that the United States may continue its participation in the Golden Gate International Exposition of San Francisco, Calif., in 1940, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the world's fair to be held by the San Francisco Bay Exposition, Inc., in the city of San Francisco during the year 1939, and for other purposes", approved July 9, 1937, as amended by this joint resolution, is extended and made applicable to the continuance of the participation of the United States in such exposition in 1940 in the same manner and to the same extent and for the same purposes as originally provided in such joint resolution of July 9, 1937.

Sec. 2. Section 6 of such joint resolution of July 9, 1937, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Commission when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$500."

Sec. 3. The second proviso of the first paragraph of section 7 of such joint resolution of July 9, 1937, is amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That the Commission may, if it deems it desirable and in the public interest, transfer, with or without consideration, the title to the Federal exhibits building or buildings or other Commission-owned property to the city and county of San Francisco or to any Federal, State, or local governmental agency."

Sec. 4. In addition to the sum of \$1,500,000 authorized by such joint resolution of July 9, 1937, to be appropriated for the participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition and appropriated by the Third Deficiency Appropriation

Act, fiscal year 1937, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200,000 for participation in 1940.

Sec. 5. The act entitled "An act to authorize the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission to produce and sell certain articles, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1938, is hereby extended and made applicable during the participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1940.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. While the amendment of the House of Representatives is not wholly satisfactory, time is of the essence, and I move, therefore, that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

## NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939, authorizing an appropriation therefor and for other purposes," approved July 9, 1937, to provide for participation in the New York World's Fair, 1940, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, to strike out all of section 3, and on page 2, line 19, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Mr. MEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

## RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Army, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolution memorializing Congress to pass the Wheeler-Jones bill scaling down farm mortgages and reducing the interest rate

Whereas the farm-mortgage problem is one of great importance to the American people, and particularly to Mississippi, where so large a portion of the people are engaged in agriculture; and

Whereas, of the 6,000,000 farms in the United States, 2,350,000 are mortgaged in an aggregate amount of approximately \$7,000,000,000; and

Whereas on March 26, 1940, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace stated that about 25 percent of the farm-mortgage debt of the country is either delinquent or has had the payments due a year ago extended; and that on January 1, 1940, a total of 139,369, or 22½ percent of the Federal land-bank loans were delinquent or had their installments extended; and

Whereas the Wheeler-Jones bill provides for a scaling down of farm mortgages and a permanent reduction of interest and gives the present occupant of a farm an opportunity to rehabilitate himself on the present farm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi memorialize the Congress of the United States to bring to successful passage this legislation, known as S. 3509 and H. R. 8748, being companion measures, in order that the benefits of this act may be extended to the farmers of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate in Washington, and the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Mississippi delegation in Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Casper (Wyo.) Trades Assembly, protesting against any changes in the so-called Wagner National Labor Relations Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Mission Provision Co., of San Antonio, Tex., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1970, the so-called La Follette civil liberties bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Presbytery of Chester in session at Glen Olden, Pa., discountenancing the action of the President in appointing a representative at the

Vatican, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the prompt enactment of the so-called Wagner-Van Nuys-Capper antilynching bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of the Women's National Aeronautical Association of the United States, signed by its national president, remonstrating against adoption of the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America (affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of Detroit, Mich., and Chrysler Local, No. 371, International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, of New Castle, Ind., favoring the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 591) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition numerously signed by veterans of the World War, of Wadsworth, Kans., praying for the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Van Nuys-Capper antilynching bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FREIGHTERS TO PANAMANIAN REGISTRY

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, at this time I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram received by me from H. F. McGrath, president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. The telegram reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 9, 1940.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,

Senate Merchant Marine Committee:

The Maritime Federation of the Pacific is resolutely opposed to the request filed by Matson Navigation Co. with the Maritime Commission yesterday to allow transfer of freighters *Mana* and *Makauao* to Panamanian registry to evade Neutrality Act. These vessels, chartered to Canadian firm, employ 100-percent union crews at present. If transfer is approved, American seamen would lose their jobs and the Maritime Commission would be countenancing an open evasion of Neutrality Act. Urge you investigate and act to block this transfer.

MARITIME FEDERATION OF THE  
PACIFIC,  
H. F. McGRATH, President.

#### EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, with the names attached, and appropriately referred, a very brief petition signed by sundry citizens of Missouri, in behalf of the so-called equal-rights amendment.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the attached signatures, as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1940.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: We, the undersigned, do implore you to aid in the immediate adoption, in our Constitution of the United States, of the equal-rights amendment. It reads:

"Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

Genevieve Thomas Wheeler, 3874 East Sixty-third Street; Aletta Ines, 2404 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Edna Virginia Crum, 3215 Forest; Leland Ada Dunnuck, 3929 Central Street; Edna Mary Jackson, 6109 Jackson Avenue; Adeline Howard, 1014 McAlpine; Ida Louella Fitchie, 3536 Bales Avenue; Gertrude McClure, 7426 Wayne; Betty Denny, 2204 East Seventieth Street; Frances Ogelvie 4223 East Sixtieth Terrace; Betty V. Calvin, 5233 Highland; Florence Willyard, Studio Building; Eva Falk Kentz, Ninety-ninth and Blue Ridge; Margaret Pinkard, 5613 Bales; Frances M. Wenne, 3928 East Fifty-eighth; Virginia Williamson, 7310 Park; Helen M. Wolf, 4555 Main; Ufa Chiarelli, 2403 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Esther B. Laude, 2228 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Virginia Gibson, 2231 East Sixty-ninth Terrace; Mrs. C. J. Dittmore, 3826 East Sixty-third Street; Helen Dittmore, 3826 East Sixty-third Street; Mrs. W. Bullard, 4230 East Sixty-third Street; Mrs. G. Hallauer, 4214 East Sixty-third Street; Benita Benson, 3890 East Sixty-third; Ruth L. Benson, 3888 East Sixty-third Street; E. S. Welty, 3866 East Sixty-third Street; Edna A. Thornton, 3842 East Sixty-third Street; Chas. Knapp, 3834

East Sixty-third; Marietta Knapp, 3834 East Sixty-third; Beulah E. Wilson, 3830 East Sixty-third Street; Bertha R. Lightburne, 3874 East Sixty-third Street; Emma T. Coyle, 4144 Locust; Meldred A. Coyle, 4144 Locust; Mrs. Jennie Vogt, 3929 Central.

#### WORLD CRISIS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD and appropriately referred two letters received today in the same mail from two of my former colleagues in the New Jersey State Senate—one from Senator Toolan of Middlesex County and the other from Senator Erickson of Cumberland County, addressed to the President of the United States.

These letters are both on the important subject of the world crisis in Europe and what America's reaction should be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

PERTH AMBOY, N. J., May 10, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Some months ago I started to dictate a letter to you, expressing some of my views in the matter of preparedness. I never mailed the letter, because I felt you were sufficiently bothered by other constituents and I should not add my tale of woe to the many others that must come across your desk daily. I think world affairs justify certain reasonable conclusions such as:

(1) There is no such thing as international honor or morality.  
(2) We are living in an age when it is utterly impossible to accept the solemn pledges, covenants, or assurances of any of the dictatorial powers.

(3) We have reverted to the law of the jungle, and power, force, and might have supplemented right, justice, and a decent regard for others.

(4) Superior power and force are the only things that the mad dogs that now dominate some governments respect.

I realize that many naval and military authorities contend that no foreign force could successfully land a sizeable expeditionary force upon the American Continent. This probably represents their honest opinion. Lawyers frequently give opinions to their clients, but when the court of last resort speaks to the contrary the opinion is meaningless and the opinion may have been the means of causing great harm to the client, who acted honestly on the basis of that opinion. The opinion of military and naval experts, that is founded upon nothing more substantial than the observation of a great minstrel that the "two best friends of the United States are the Atlantic and the Pacific," is not sufficient security for me in these times. Wherefore, Bill, I believe:

(a) That America should proceed at once to build up an Army of 1,000,000 men.

(b) That this Army should be organized for modern warfare and not upon the old cumbersome basis of the World War.

(c) That this Army should be equipped with the best motorized devices known to modern inventive genius. It should be schooled in the philosophy of the blitzkrieg. Recent happenings in Poland and Norway demonstrate that it is useless to stack mortal man with a rifle against steel in the form of tanks and high-powered armored cars.

(d) That we should have the greatest air force in the world.

(e) That on the Atlantic seaboard our Navy should have an abundance of light, fast craft. If England wins this war, we will not need battleships on the Atlantic seaboard. If she loses the war, Germany has few heavily armored ships. Of course, we need the big battleships in the Pacific because Japan's Navy is intact.

I am not posing as a military or naval strategist. I do, however, firmly believe that every dollar invested in preparedness at this time represents an insurance premium which we must pay for future security.

The people back home are thinking seriously of these matters. I am certain that they will support and sustain our representatives in Washington who insist upon complete preparation for every eventuality. The Government in England was caught napping. Every street urchin can now tell wise men of England what they should have done. What England should have done, but failed to do a few years ago, must be done by us today, or a year or so hence we may look more foolish than England does today.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. TOOLAN.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

BRIDGETON, N. J., May 10, 1940.

United States Senator SMATHERS,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: This may be somewhat presumptuous upon my part, but world affairs have reached the stage where I think decent people ought to speak, and I am sending you enclosed herewith a copy of a letter which I am today mailing to the President.

May I say to you that if I were in your place I would forthwith introduce in the United States Senate a resolution calling upon the President to sever all diplomatic relations with all powers in the world who have in the past assumed an aggressive attitude toward their neighbors. They have nothing we want, and as an individual I refuse to sanction the sale of scrap iron to Japan to kill off Chinese or to lend to Germany or Italy our moral support in the things that they are doing to the rest of the world.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD W. ERICKSON.

BRIDGETON, N. J., May 10, 1940.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You may class me as a fool, and, after all, that probably will make little difference.

However, I want to say that in civilian life we banish from society outright liars. At least they are banished to the extent that other people refuse to trust them, or have confidence in them in any way, and it seems to me we are fast approaching a state when the practices which we adopt in civilian life are applied in international relations.

While I am absolutely opposed to the United States entering into an armed conflict—and may I pause to say that three of four brothers were in the last one—I think it is time that the United States Government took a definite stand in the present European conflict.

It is quite evident that the word of the totalitarian powers cannot be taken, and they certainly have nothing that we need or want, and I am strongly in favor of breaking off all diplomatic relations, and all commerce treaties, with any power who takes an aggressive attitude toward any other power.

This may be considered as a breach of neutrality by some, but to me it is a question of common decency, and I think the sooner certain totalitarian powers are given to understand that there are some decent people in the world, with a high conception of moral principles applied to an international situation, by our refusing to have any relations with them at all, they will at least recognize that their position is not secure.

May I say that the breaking off of public relations with Germany to me is highly advisable, in view of the aggressions of which they are guilty, and I believe such a procedure would awaken the common sense embodied in the masses of the German people.

I am not exactly an amateur, having served 12 years in an executive position, served 3 years in the New Jersey Senate, and sat alongside of United States Senator SMATHERS during that time, and for 3 years have been on the bench, and to me it is definitely time for the United States Government to take a more definite stand in world affairs than we have in the past.

I might say to you that I have always been an advocate of the League of Nations, whose decrees were not to be enforced by an army, but economic sanction, and that is what I am now advocating so far as the present situation is concerned. I am strongly convinced that the trouble with the world affairs today is the wholesale conspiracy entered into by the Republican Senators against Woodrow Wilson, which kept us out of the League of Nations.

The totalitarians had their growth in other countries, and with absolute security Mussolini marched into Ethiopia, while everybody else sat by complacently and permitted him to do it. An economic sanction at that time would have seriously interfered with his program, and probably have kept him from carrying it out. Following Ethiopia, the other world powers sat by and saw Spain invaded by a foreign army, which to me was the most diabolical thing which has ever happened. I do not care what form of government exists within a given country, but I am seriously concerned when a foreign power attempts to dictate the internal policies of another country. After these two programs were put over, we find Mussolini invading Albania, and Germany putting the iron heel upon all of the peace-loving countries of Europe.

If this world catastrophe is to be stopped, it is time we, as a world power, took cognizance of what is going on and refuse by severing trade relations to give these powers our passive sanction.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to United States Senator SMATHERS, with whom, as I said before, I sat in the New Jersey Senate for 3 years.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD W. ERICKSON.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3686) to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1582) thereon.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7811) to establish the Hot

Springs division of the western judicial district of Arkansas, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1583) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3464) to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3223) for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1584) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3649) for the relief of Harry D. Gann, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1585) thereon.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3683) to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9013) to transfer Harde-man County, Tex., from the Fort Worth division to the Wichita Falls division of the northern judicial district of Texas, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1586) thereon.

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) authorizing the temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of a painting of the scene at the signing of the Constitution, and the holding of ceremonies in connection therewith (reported by Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library on the 6th instant), reported it without amendment.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 265, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 265) submitted by Mrs. CARAWAY on May 2, 1940, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 213, agreed to April 10, 1940, authorizing the Committee on Enrolled Bills to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the remainder of the present session, is hereby amended to include the time from the beginning of the session to the date of adoption of the said resolution.

VIOLA FINLEY

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 267, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 267) submitted by Mr. SMATHERS on May 7, 1940, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Viola Finley, widow of Harry I. Finley, late clerk in the office of Senator SMATHERS, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### OLIVER WENDALL HOLMES MEMORIAL FUND (S. DOC. NO. 197)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit for appropriate disposition the report of the committee appointed under Public Resolution No. 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session (C. 595, 52 Stat. 943). This report contains the committee recommendations concerning the use of the bequest and devise made to the United States by the late Mr. Justice Holmes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as a document.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 3962. A bill for the relief of the Louis Puccinelli Bail Bond Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3963. A bill for the relief of Catherine Greening; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3964. A bill granting a pension to Earnest Hill Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 3965. A bill for the relief of Julia Neville;

S. 3966. A bill for the relief of Peter Konotopko; and

S. 3967. A bill for the relief of the Cold Spring Brewing Co., of Cold Spring, Minn., and the Schuster Brewing Co., of Rochester, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3968. A bill providing for acquisition of privately owned lands in the Superior National Forest and the Kabetogama and Grand Portage Purchase Units; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 3969. A bill for the relief of Meier Langermann, his wife, Friederike, and son, Joseph; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 3970. A bill relating to the residence requirements for persons appointed to the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

S. 3971 (by request). A bill to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or in any national park or forest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3972. A bill to authorize exchanges of lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 3973. A bill for the relief of E. B. Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3974. A bill to clarify section 3709 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to make temporary emergency provision for the determination of foreign construction costs under section 502 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Commerce.

## CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY OF THE TELEGRAPH INDUSTRY

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 268), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 95, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to June 19, 1939, directing a study of the telegraph industry and certain other matters, is hereby continued in full force and effect during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Committee on Interstate Commerce is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during such sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods, the amounts authorized for said purposes.

## DRAFT OF WEALTH IN TIME OF WAR—NOTICE BY SENATOR LEE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at this time I give notice that it is my intention at the first opportunity to press for consideration of Calendar No. 474, Senate bill 1650, a bill to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government.

## ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO EIGHTH AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the

United States to the Eighth American Scientific Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO KING LEOPOLD

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940, entitled "Roosevelt Tells King Leopold United States Hopes for Belgian Victory," which appears in the Appendix.]

## CONDEMNATION BY POPE PIUS XII OF ATTACK ON BELGIUM, HOLLAND AND LUXEMBURG

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 12, 1940, entitled "Pope Condemns Nazi Attacks on Low Countries," which appears in the Appendix.]

## A WORLD IN FLAMES—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 12, 1940, entitled "A World in Flames," which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY SECRETARY WALLACE BEFORE IOWA DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. HERRING asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, at the opening of the Iowa Democratic State Convention at Des Moines, Iowa, on May 11, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT 75 YEARS OF NEGRO PROGRESS EXPOSITION

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the 75 Years of Negro Progress Exposition, at Detroit, Mich., on May 12, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

## INEQUALITY BETWEEN FARM AND NONFARM INCOME

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun relating to the inequality between the farm and nonfarm income, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from O. R. McGuire, chairman of the special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association, published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 12, 1940, with reference to the Logan-Walter bill for the regulation of administrative procedure, which appears in the Appendix.]

## DEFENSE PREPARATIONS

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Omaha Morning World-Herald of May 11, 1940, entitled "Wake Up, America!" which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY DR. C. L. NELSON AT ROCHESTER, MINN.

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Dr. C. L. Nelson, Democratic chairman of the First Congressional District, at Rochester, Minn., on April 29, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

## AMERICAN LEGION PROGRAM OF WORLD PEACE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion, relating to the Legion's program of world peace and foreign relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY E. G. B. RILEY ON HOME-DEFENSE FORCE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by E. G. B. Riley on the subject of a home-defense force, which appears in the Appendix.]

## A LYNCHLESS YEAR—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 12, 1940, entitled "A Lynchless Year," which appears in the Appendix.]

## CONDITION OF THE ARMY AND FORMULATION OF A MILITARY POLICY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to the Senate relating to the condition of the United States Army as facts have become available to those of us on the subcommittee on military appropriations who have been studying the matter. My statement will be so brief that it will not lay proper stress on the qualities of the Army and on its good points, which is something I should like to do, because it is always human nature to stress deficiencies.

I think it is not to be argued that there is a very able officer corps in our Army and that all members of the committee who heard them were very much impressed with the personnel, from General Marshall down. In what I am going to say also I want it understood that I have the highest admiration and regard both for the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I was once a member, and the chairman of the subcommittee on military appropriations, a member of which I now happen to be. Certainly the fairness and patriotism with which they have approached this problem is very commendable.

The fact remains, however, that our Army today is not what it ought to be. We have a Regular force of 223,000 and a National Guard of 200,000, making a total of 423,000 men. But at the present time we have weapons for only 75,000. That is, counting tanks, semiautomatic rifles, machine guns, antitank and anti-aircraft guns, field artillery, and other such essentials for a modern army, we could at this moment put in the field fully equipped only an army of 75,000 men, and if we had suddenly to procure sufficient weapons for an army of 400,000 we would be confronted by delay which might last anywhere from 15 to 18 months, a delay which, of course, under modern war conditions, with the science of war moving as fast as it does, might be disastrous. The effect of this kind of a delay on the fortunes of Great Britain in the current European war has, I think, impressed us all.

If we had to remedy this deficiency in weapons, we not only should be confronted with the problem that we have not the necessary plants in which to produce these weapons, but we also have not a sufficient number of personnel who know how to make them. In other words, a nation may be the richest nation on the face of the earth—as we are supposed to be—and still find that there are things that money cannot buy; and human skill and experience are among the things that cannot be bought by the yard. At the present moment we are suffering from the apathy which has been a general condition regarding our national defense since the World War, and we are faced with the fact that our principal bottle neck is in having men who know how to make the required weapons.

Mr. President, a similar condition will be found to exist insofar as the air force is concerned. The Air Corps at the present time tell me that they could not use larger appropriations than are now carried in the bill, because if they got more airplanes than are now provided, they could not furnish pilots for them, and they cannot educate and train any more pilots than they are now training without running into a grave risk of loss of lives, because the number of teachers is so limited. The number of instructors who are qualified to teach flying cadets is so small that, if we should start increasing the pupils, it would be necessary to spread the instruction so thin that in all probability some boys would lose their lives. In other words, here again we are faced with the fact that we have not skilled personnel in sufficiently large numbers and that we cannot improvise that kind of training on short notice. We can build another Kelly Field or Brooks Field or Randolph Field—we can build them certainly—but we cannot pull out of a silk hat the additional instructors who are necessary.

I understand that if a nation were to endeavor to create an air force of 25,000 pilots under present conditions it would have to allow 2 years to do so, because it would be necessary to subject 150,000 boys to physical examination before selecting the ones who measure up to the very stringent qualifications; and then, if they are to have safe and sound instruction, there cannot very well be more than five pupils to a teacher. That means between 5,000 and 6,000 instructors. Where are

we going to get them? The only place we can get them is out of the front line; and if we should take 6,000 men out of the front line of our air service in a war, what would happen to our defense?

I merely point that out to show the terrible dilemma in which a nation finds itself when it leaves these things until the last minute. We can leave the provision for many quarter-master items to the last minute, because we make such items in time of peace anyway; but we cannot improvise on short notice the human skill that fights these weapons, or the human skill that manufactures them.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I understand, then, the Senator is urging that we step up our facilities for training pilots, and for building planes. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. No; it cannot be done during the next fiscal year.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator favor doing it?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have it done when it can be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. When can it be done?

Mr. LEE. If the Senator will allow me an observation, I should like to have it done now. I should like to see immediately launched a program providing for training not 5,000 pilots but 250,000 pilots.

Mr. LODGE. Whom would the Senator use for instructors?

Mr. LEE. That is the trouble. I think the Senator from Massachusetts was present in the committee when I asked General Arnold why we could not have instructors placed in a number of military academies which are asking for instructors, and his answer was that we did not have a sufficient number, which only emphasizes what the Senator from Massachusetts is saying, and what I believe, that we find ourselves in a very weak position, so far as the air is concerned.

If the Senator will be kind enough to yield further, up until now we have been told in the committees by the generals of the Army and the admirals of the Navy that the air force is merely an auxiliary; but Germany has used the air arm of its military force as the spearhead of its "blitzkrieg."

Mr. LODGE. I should like to complete my statement. I think there is much truth in what the Senator from Oklahoma says, but it is such a large subject that I do not think he could cover it within the space of time I am prepared to yield. If he is saying that the present European war has thrown an entirely new light and new emphasis on aviation, I heartily agree with him; but during the coming fiscal year—and it is surprising to me, as I think it is surprising to a number of other Senators—during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1941, which is the period with which we are now concerned, we could not increase the training of our pilots without great risk of incurring a casualty rate which, of course, we would not be justified in doing in time of peace.

Mr. President, those are two major considerations; but everybody today is asking himself other questions. We are asking ourselves the question, What should be our anti-aircraft policy? I suppose it is no secret that of the new 90-millimeter gun which has been invented we have no supply at all. We have merely a few pilot models. We have only about 400 3-inch guns, though I suppose that around the great cities of Europe there are several thousand of such guns. So the question arises, What should be our anti-aircraft policy?

When we come to the question of producing these difficult items, we know that in Europe nations set up what are known as shadow plants—plants which are set up with all the necessary machinery and equipment, and then locked up until war comes, when they are opened, and at once the nations get large-scale production of these weapons. That is something for us to consider. It is the only way in which we shall avoid a terrible delay when an emergency arises.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator spoke of the time required for preparation of the Air Corps; and then he spoke of the new 90-millimeter guns, and the fact that we have only a few of them at this time. What is the period of production of such guns?

Mr. LODGE. I am unable to give it accurately. Such heavy items of ordnance take more than a year.

Mr. BRIDGES. That could not be done, either, during the fiscal year?

Mr. LODGE. No; it could not.

Then we ought to ask ourselves the question, What kind of an Army do we want? What is the area which we want to protect? Do we want to have an Army that can protect continental United States? Of course we do. Do we want to have an Army that we will send to Europe? Of course we do not. We are not going to develop an Army for that purpose. Do we want an Army that can defend continental United States and prevent a foreign power from establishing itself either in the Caribbean area or in the North Atlantic area? I contend that we do want such an Army. I contend that we should have an Army that would be able to do that even if the fleet were in the Pacific and the Panama Canal were destroyed.

Those are important considerations, not only important to the Army and to the Congress, but the questions involved ought to be widely understood and proposals to meet the conditions should be approved by the American people.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator expresses a desire to have an Army sufficient to defend North America and the West Indies. How much of an Army does the Senator think would be required to do that?

Mr. LODGE. Without the fleet?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am accepting the Senator's proposition. What does the Senator think? How much of an Army and what kind of an Army would be required to do that?

Mr. LODGE. I can only give my own guess.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is on the Military Committee, and we are looking to him to advise the Senate about these matters, and he seems willing to advise them to a certain extent. I should like to go the whole way, because those of us who know nothing about these subjects are anxious to provide whatever military and naval force is necessary to secure these very desirable and patriotic objectives. Now, I should like the Senator to tell us.

Mr. LODGE. I am immeasurably flattered by what the Senator from Texas says, because he is not one of those who hand out compliments indiscriminately. The purpose of my speech, when I come to the conclusion of it, is to point out the fact that none of us knows sufficient about these things, and that we ought to have an investigation of them; but my guess, for what it is worth—and it is merely one man's guess—is that with the fleet being in the Atlantic, an army of 450,000 men—that is, the initial protective force—if it were equipped, could take care of that situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator, then, favors increase of the Army at the present time to 450,000 men?

Mr. LODGE. I favor providing the weapons for that number of men, because, of course, it does not do us any good to have the men if we have not the weapons.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the other hand, it does not do us any good to have the weapons unless we have the men.

Mr. LODGE. No; but the men are there, and the weapons are not.

Mr. CONNALLY. The men are not trained.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely want to find out what the Senator advises us to do, because, as one Senator and one citizen, I want the United States now—not next year, or 3 years from now, or 10 years from now, but now—to start establishing a sufficient military and naval defense armament—men, munitions, and everything else—to protect the United States and all the contiguous territories in the Western Hemisphere if it becomes necessary so to do.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator from Texas, and I am very grateful to him for rising and making his statement, and lending the weight of his influence to this proposal, because I think he is absolutely correct.

Today, Mr. President, we have what is called a skeleton army. It is not even a complete skeleton, because many ribs are not in it. We have not been approaching the Army problem and thinking about it from a proper standpoint. None of us here would vote for the appropriation of money for a battleship, for instance, without giving it all the clerks, and radio operators, and doctors, and other personnel it needs; but years go by and we set up the various Army corps, which correspond roughly to battleships, and we call them into existence without the medical personnel or any of the corps troops essential to make them complete units.

We have to change and improve and modernize our thinking in military matters. I do not believe we can ever go back to the lax condition which has obtained. I submit that we should continue every year having concentrations such as are now being held along the Sabine River, because an army which does not get together and train as an army is bound to be as incompetent and as unequal to the task which confronts it as the Navy would be if it did not train as a fleet.

We hear a great deal about the cost of these things, and, of course, the cost, when measured by the standards of one individual, are very high, and in this country the cost of making things is relatively high; but I should like to point out—and I have a table before me which I shall ask later to have inserted in the RECORD—that, taking the year 1938, the cost of the national defense was only 5.8 percent of the total cost of all our governments—Federal, State, and local.

Putting it into terms of national income, for the year 1938 the cost of our national defense amounted to 1.47 percent of the national income, compared with the cost of the British national defense which, although inadequate, as we now see, amounted to 5.37 percent of their national income. The French national defense cost 6.36 percent of the national income; the Italian national defense cost more than 13 percent of the national income; and the Japanese national defense cost 30 percent of the national income. I have no figures for Germany.

Mr. President, I ask to have the table to which I have been referring inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

<i>United States</i>	
National-defense expenditures, <sup>1</sup> fiscal year 1938.....	\$1, 015, 527, 083
Total cost of Federal, State, and local governments, fiscal year 1938.....	\$17, 470, 000, 000
Cost of national defense in percent of total governmental costs.....	5.81

<sup>1</sup> Includes expenditures for Navy and military and departmental for Army; excludes rivers and harbors, Panama Canal, and other nonmilitary items.

	National income	Appropriations, national defense	National defense in percent of national income
United States, 1938.....	\$63, 993, 000, 000	\$942, 335, 183	1.47
United Kingdom, 1938.....	26, 600, 000, 000	1, 428, 079, 000	5.37
France, 1938.....	11, 500, 000, 000	731, 501, 000	6.36
Italy, 1938.....	5, 200, 000, 000	712, 100, 000	13.69
Germany, 1938.....	32, 000, 000, 000	9, 600, 000, 000	30.20
Japan, 1939.....	5, 300, 000, 000	1, 600, 850, 347	30.20

Figures for United States only for fiscal year 1939:

Preliminary estimates for 1939 on national income.....	\$68, 500, 000, 000. 00
National-defense appropriations for fiscal year 1939.....	\$1, 018, 576, 998. 00
National defense in percent of national income, 1939.....	1.49

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Senator have available the percentage of the income of the Government which is going into

its national defense? As I gather, the Senator's figures are based upon a hypothetical figure of national income—not actual Government income.

Mr. LODGE. I have the figures as to the cost of our national defense in percentages of total governmental costs—that is, Federal, State, and local—and the figure is 5.81 percent.

Mr. ADAMS. That still does not answer my question. What percentage of the Federal Government income is going into national defense?

Mr. LODGE. I have not the figure.

Mr. ADAMS. More than one-third of the Federal income is going into national defense.

Mr. LODGE. But it is 5 percent of what the people spend for Government as a whole.

I was about to conclude. I have stated only a few of the fundamental considerations to which none of us, I think, has the answers today, and which indicate that, in the broad and fundamental sense of the word, we have not a military policy. We have our National Defense Act of 1920, which, of course, falls under the shadow of the thought of the World War—a type of military thought which, I submit, is very different from the type of military thought which prevails today. Our military policy, so far as I have observed it, has been whatever the individuals who happen to be in the General Staff and the individuals who happen to be in official positions in Congress feel it should be for any given year, but there is nothing that is widely understood and approved by the people—there is nothing that is as definite and as far-reaching and as thorough as it should be.

I think we want an army adequate to keep us at peace; we want an army so large and so strong that the totalitarian nations, who understand only the language of force, will look at the United States and say, "It will not pay us to molest the United States." That may not seem to be a very high-flown type of argument, but I believe it is the only type of argument which appeals to certain individuals in the world today who are making so much trouble for the human race.

We have tried throughout our history to keep at peace by being unprepared, and I submit it has not worked. We tried it at the time of the World War; we tried it before that time; but, in spite of our attempts, because of our unpreparedness, our country has had a war on an average of nearly every 30 years. I submit it is about time we tried the other systems, of being so manifestly well prepared that no nation will want to molest us.

Mr. President, for that reason I should like to present a concurrent resolution, which calls for a special joint committee, to be composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, to formulate a military policy for the United States, then to ascertain the facts regarding our present condition, and make recommendations to Congress for any legislation which may be necessary, and any appropriations which may be needed. That is something which our present committees are not set up to handle. My thought is that, of course, the members of the select committee should come from the Committee on Military Affairs and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling military appropriations.

Mr. President, I present the concurrent resolution, and ask that it lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and lie on the table.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a special joint committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized and directed to (1) formulate a military policy for the United States, (2) ascertain facts regarding the present condition of the United States Army with respect to its ability to carry out such policy, and (3) report to the Congress not later than January 3, 1941, recommendations for any legislation, including appropriations, deemed necessary in order to carry out such policy. A vacancy in the special joint committee*

shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The special joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

For the purposes of this resolution the special joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-sixth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$ shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am in thorough accord with the general remarks made by the Senator from Massachusetts; in fact, I am entirely happy that we have a new recruit on the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate who takes exactly the same view I have taken for the past 5 or 6 years, namely, that we should increase our appropriations for national defense. I think the members of the committee will testify that there has been no one on the committee who has been more willing to vote for increased appropriations for national defense than I have been. But I cannot agree with the Senator's proposal that a special committee is necessary for the consideration of this problem.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts had the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. The members of the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and the House formulated the National Defense Act, which the Senator suggests now needs modification, and those committees are perfectly capable of handling that subject and doing whatever may be necessary at this time. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives is made up of men who serve almost exclusively on that committee and devote practically all their time to it; and we have almost the same situation in the Senate. It is not necessary to create a small special committee for this purpose, when we have regularly constituted committees to carry on the work. I cannot agree with the Senator that a special committee is necessary.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has pretty well covered his point.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to say a word in reply to the Senator from Arizona.

I may say that one of our committees deals with appropriations, and if the members of the committee get the idea that some legislation is necessary, they cannot do anything about it. The other committee does not control the purse strings. In view of those two conditions, I think the subject should be considered by one committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have just read an article by a famous reporter, Thomas L. Stokes, about the need for a thorough survey of our Army forces, published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of today; also an editorial entitled "Inventory Needed," published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of today; and an article by Raymond Clapper entitled "Let's Take Stock," which refers to my proposal for a resolution to investigate the national defense, and it asks:

Will the fact that a Republican takes the initiative kill the idea again? Or is partisanship to be brushed aside?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles and the editorial be printed at the conclusion of my remarks made earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair).  
Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles and editorial are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 13, 1940]

**THOROUGH OVERHAUL URGED FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES**

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Congress will hear this week demands for a thorough recheck of our Military Establishment, both Army and Navy, with the object of revising and overhauling it to meet modern defense and tactical problems developed by the Norwegian and Holland-Belgium campaigns in Europe.

Senator LODGE (Republican, Mass.) will introduce a resolution calling for creation of special joint committees, one to look into the Army, the other into the Navy, selected from the Appropriations, Military, and Naval Committees of the Senate and House.

His proposal is that the committees shall work steadily to explore the national defense and lay down a policy to meet present-day conditions.

With particular reference to the Army, Senator LODGE said:

"We have no military policy. It is just what Congress may say it is from time to time. We must have a definite policy based on the realities of today."

Senator CONNALLY (Democrat, Tex.), a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, emphasized the need of an inquiry into the Navy, particularly as affects the relative importance of sea and air power, to make sure that the lavish naval appropriations are spent in the best interests of national defense.

"If this country doesn't have the best navy in the world," he said, it must be "because the naval officers have not kept up with the best and newest ideas and designs and improvement, since Congress has appropriated generously.

"Sometimes," he added, "the admirals seem to suffer from what is called mental fatigue. And, apparently, some of them are allergic to new ideas."

**CONGRESS SHOULD DO IT**

Both Senators favor inquiry by Congress rather than by an outside board on which Army and Navy officers and civilians would be represented, as has been suggested in some quarters. Senator CONNALLY said emphatically that the responsibility is that of Congress. Senator LODGE pointed out the danger of friction in outside boards and said that congressional committees which have handled defense problems can work more effectively.

Senator LODGE, who is a student of military and naval problems as a member of the Appropriations Committee, raised numerous questions as to the mission of our Army in national defense and its size, and the urgent need for modern equipment of various types, for more instructors to train aviation pilots, and for revision of procurement plans.

"I think the Navy is much nearer preparedness than the Army," he said. "It is much better off.

"The Navy doesn't have the Army's problem of a lack of weapons. The Navy's problem is whether it has the right weapons. I think that air power's apparent ability to deny to the British Navy the use of Norwegian coastal waters is a development which ought to be thoroughly understood.

"Even if German planes didn't sink a battleship, the fact that they made it impossible for the British Navy to carry out its function raises a fundamental question for us. The relationship of air to sea power ought to be studied most carefully.

"In our Navy the question is whether the relation of air power to sea power is correct.

"In the Army I see the need of a sweeping new policy.

"The Navy is now 85 percent mobilized; the Army 15 percent.

"We're supposed to have a skeleton Army, but many ribs are missing. We haven't made up our minds how much of an Army we need.

"Do we want an Army that we can send to fight in Europe? Certainly not. Do we want an Army that can defend the continental United States and the North Atlantic and the Caribbean area? Emphatically yes.

"Do we want an Army that can do that job if the Navy is in the Pacific and the Panama Canal is in danger? I submit that we do.

"The World War methods of trench warfare and large masses of infantry bear only a remote relationship to the present day of mobile warfare with great numbers of mechanized vehicles. All of our concepts have to be revised."

**OUR GUNS OBSOLETE**

Senator LODGE pointed out that, as regards antiaircraft defense, we have none of the new 90-millimeter type of antiaircraft guns. Of the old 3-inch type, which we do have, some are now obsolete, he said.

Whether our present antiaircraft defense policy is adequate should be studied, the Senator said. We are not equipped, he added, to prevent establishment of land bases in Greenland, Baffin Island, and Newfoundland.

He stressed the need of far more instructors to train aviation pilots.

"If we tried to increase our training now, with present instructors, we'd run into casualties. We are stretching our instructors as thin as we can now with safety."

There are now 300 instructors, not counting ground crew, mechanics, and other personnel. Six thousand are needed, Senator LODGE contends, with a program for training 25,000 pilots in 2 years. In-

structors should come from the front line, he said, which means replacements for them. Another training station, he added, is necessary beyond the three now operating.

A big difficulty encountered by the British and French, he explained, is the training of pilots.

**ARMY SHORTAGES**

Turning to deficiencies in the Army, he said that while there now are 223,000 men in the Regular Army and 200,000 in the National Guard there are modern arms to equip only 75,000.

To turn out war material not produced ordinarily by our factories in peacetime, Senator LODGE suggested the building of so-called shadow plants. Such plants in European nations, he explained, remain idle in peacetime, but are maintained and kept in readiness for immediate operation.

"We could use W. P. A. labor to build these plants and maintain them in peacetime," he said.

The military policy, he continued, should be understood not only by the experts and Congress but by the public.

"We can never go back to our old system. We must have frequent concentrations and training for the Army. The Army isn't an army unless it gets together for training. We can't just go on doing squads right at some military post."

The investigation he proposes should start at once, he said, and Congress should remain in continual session, with recesses of not more than 2 or 3 weeks.

**INVENTORY NEEDED**

It is easy to criticize the Allies for having let Germany outstrip them in armaments. But what of ourselves?

If in the near future a foreign power or coalition were to attack the United States, or another nation in this hemisphere, many soft spots in our defenses would be exposed. Congress has been voting billions for the Army and Navy, but new weaknesses seem to bob up faster than old ones are corrected.

Congress and the public seem willing enough to provide all the defense money that the professionals of the Army and Navy demand. And yet it is apparent that we are ill-prepared.

The Army is far short of the essential equipment for even the modest "initial protective force" of some 400,000 men which it proposes to throw into the field overnight in the event of an invasion.

Of course, the Navy will see to it that nobody lands on American shores, it is argued. And that is probably true. But probably is not enough. The art of naval warfare is moving at a snail's pace compared with the art of aerial war. Even Secretary of the Navy Edison confesses concern about the vulnerability of battleships to bombing attack. The British Navy for the moment stands as an outer line of defense for us, but who can say what will happen to the British Navy in the next few months?

Winston Churchill wrote of Britain's warships: "Open the sea-cocks and let them sink beneath the surface, and in a few minutes—half an hour at the most—the whole outlook of the world would be changed. The British Empire would dissolve like a dream." And so would the smug doctrine of American invulnerability.

It seems to us that the public is entitled to an inventory and accounting of our defense establishment and plans. Not by the admirals and generals; while it is commonly agreed that the men of our high commands are exceptionally competent, they are, after all, the creatures of a caste and a tradition.

Congress should provide for a general reexamination of the whole defense picture, either through a broad-gage joint committee of the House and Senate or through a committee pooling congressional and public intellects.

Such a committee should find out and let the public know the answers to such questions as these:

Is our coast-defense artillery adequate to beat off a hostile navy if our own Navy should be engaged elsewhere?

Are antiquated organization and bureaucratic moss responsible for the faulty warship designs which are revealed from time to time?

Is Army-Navy jealousy damaging the efficiency of our aerial defenses offshore and preventing full cooperation in landing-party maneuvers?

Is our industry making satisfactory progress toward preparedness for the emergency production of military essentials?

Are we in danger of being strangled by shortages of tin, rubber, and other vital imports in case of war?

Are we paying proper attention to the defenses of Alaska, whose outlying islands might be stepping stones for invasion from the Orient?

Is it true that the United States does not have enough antiaircraft guns to protect a single great city? And, if so, what is being done about it?

Whereas in 1917-18 the Allies were able to equip the A. E. F. with artillery and rifles and planes, is it possible that we would be able to equip ourselves in the next war?

Are the Army and Navy getting adequate information from the European war, and are they applying this information to the improvement of our own defense equipment and plans?

Endless other questions suggest themselves.

The people want to make our defenses impregnable. But they will want to know where the money is going and whether they are getting their dollars' worth.

It is time for a full-dress investigation, not a muck-raking expedition, but a fact-finding survey to seek out our weaknesses and expedite their cures.

LET'S TAKE STOCK  
(By Raymond Clapper)

This time, perhaps, petty jealousies won't stand in the way of setting up a joint commission for study of our national defense. The urgency of such action now must be apparent to all.

The idea didn't make the grade when it was suggested back in 1938, after Munich.

On December 20, 1938, I wrote: "Hitler could change the world outlook overnight, but there is little expectation here that he will. Convinced of his strength and contemptuous of the democracies, Hitler seems determined, from all information reaching here, to ride out his destiny, win or lose."

On December 21, 1938: "The biggest national-defense need right now is to find out what we need for national defense. \* \* \* One special national-defense committee, combining House and Senate Members, dealing informedly with the whole subject, is the primary need."

On December 22, 1938: "Recent world changes have thrust so many considerations into the problem of national defense that Congress would be justified in resorting to special procedure. The most practical method would be to set up a joint House and Senate committee on national defense."

On December 23, 1938: "We are entering a new phase of national defense, forced upon us by changed world conditions. The whole problem of defense must be reexamined. There is only one way to undertake that task—by considering national defense as a unified, interlocking whole."

On December 28, 1938: "A joint congressional committee is the best protection the administration can have against the twin mistakes of inadequate defense and wasteful expenditure."

And on December 30, 1938: "It looks as if we couldn't have that joint House and Senate committee on national defense to make a study of the whole problem. \* \* \* As one of the House leaders explained, chairmen of the regular committees in the House are extremely jealous of their prerogatives."

That was the rock upon which this idea was shattered more than a year ago. Just the one obstacle—committee chairmen extremely jealous of their prerogatives. So nothing was done. The task was left cut up into small pieces among 10 committees.

Now, Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, is reviving the idea, preparing two joint committees, one for naval affairs, another for the Army. Will the fact that a Republican takes the initiative kill the idea again? Or is partisanship to be brushed aside? Are committee chairmen going to continue to be extremely jealous of their prerogatives? Are they going to act like a crowd of Chamberlains? Or are they going to recognize the enormity of the task and join in appropriate methods of executing it efficiently and intelligently?

Action of this kind is far more to the point than vague agitation for "saving civilization." We have a civilization over here. It could be better. But it is so much better than any others the world has to offer just now that we can well devote ourselves to making it secure in this hemisphere.

There is still time to think before the slogans engulf us in hysteria—not too much time, for you can feel the slogans coming on now. We hear the big one already, "The world can't exist half slave and half free." Why can't it? It always has.

Of late tyranny has become more efficient. Democracy must become more efficient. When people begin to say that the world can't exist half slave and half free, it sounds as if the next sentence must read, "We must make the world safe for democracy."

Possibly so. But first of all it might be a good idea to be sure the Western Hemisphere is safe for us.

The way to begin is to take stock, through a joint congressional committee. Then, after taking stock, take action.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it might be argued that a year ago our Army and Navy and air force were adequate, as the world situation then existed, but certainly no person in his right mind who has any comprehension of the defense needs of our own country at this moment will contend that our Army and Navy and air force are adequate, in view of existing situations throughout the world. We do not want the Army and Navy and air force to go to war with any nation outside of our own country, but certainly, in the light of recent developments, we have not sufficient means in the United States at the present time to defend a country of this size. We might have been content a year ago to suppose that we had a defense, but no man who is even moderately well informed as to present conditions will assume that we are in a state of defense at the present time.

What the Senator from Massachusetts says about our not having the men to manufacture battleships, or airplanes, or antitank guns, or machine guns, or the Garand rifle, or any number of other articles which are necessary in carrying on warfare, is to a large extent true; but under existing conditions, the place where that shortage should be remedied is right here in the Congress, because Congress is already well versed in this situation as a result of numerous hearings which have been proceeding concurrently during the present session. I think the Congress should remain in session dur-

ing the summer and put this Nation in a state of defense, for the lessons are well borne out that countries which are unable to defend themselves do not keep out of war, but get into war. All we need is to look at China, Ethiopia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium; and who knows what tomorrow morning's news may be? Certainly the war is very likely to spread. Means of attack which were not used in the last war are already in evidence. We have not the ships we need; we have not the planes; we have not the equipment; we have not enough factories; and we do not have sufficient trained personnel in the factories we have. To some extent we lack critical material. Our Army is too small.

Mr. President, those are simply a few of the conditions which I believe the thoughtful person will concede must be remedied if our country is to maintain its rightful place among the nations of the world.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's argument, but this thought occurs to me: I think everyone is in entire accord with respect to the necessity of the United States having the completest possible national defense, but during the present administration we have spent in excess of \$6,000,000,000 in building up the Army and the Navy, and now we are told that we are pitifully unprepared.

Simply because an emergency has developed abroad, are we going to turn over lump sums to the same outfit of bunglers that apparently wasted the \$6,000,000,000 we spent, without finding out what it is to be spent for, and whether we are to have any better defense after we spend the additional money than we now have?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, while I appreciate that there is a great deal of weight to what my friend and colleague the Senator from Missouri has said, I do not believe we can measure national defense in terms of the money which may have been spent on it. National defense is only as good as are the soldiers and the equipment which are necessary to the occasion. Without the soldiers and the equipment, all the money spent amounts to nothing. Of course, it is pertinent to see that our money is expended wisely.

Mr. President, we do not have enough aviators. Certainly the airplane has demonstrated itself to be a tremendous weapon both of attack and defense. There can be no doubt about that; it is now outside the realm of speculation. While it is pleasing to note that our airplane manufacturing facilities are being expanded rapidly, we do not have the necessary number of trained pilots, and we are not proceeding as rapidly as we could proceed to develop trained pilots.

It has been brought out that we lack certain kinds of guns and that we do not have sufficient trained personnel and equipment for the guns we have. It would be wise, in my judgment, if we were not only to try to get additional guns, so as to equip the force we now have, but also train additional men in the use of such guns.

Mr. President, a man cannot learn to shoot a machine gun as he can a shotgun. A machine gun is much like a piece of artillery. It requires a knowledge of map reading, it requires a knowledge of figuring out firing data, and it requires the ability to shoot at night when the man back of the gun cannot see as well as in the daylight. It requires the knowledge of how to hit a target that cannot be seen from the place where the gun is located, such as the reverse side of a hill, or indirect firing, as it is called. It takes months to train men in that kind of activity. So the situation might be illustrated with respect to every other arm, even with respect to the rifle itself. The proper care and the use of the rifle and the bayonet cannot be learned by simply snapping a finger.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have very high regard for the military experience and judgment of the Senator from Maryland.

He adverts to the fact that we have not a sufficient number of men being trained as air pilots.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why have we not a sufficient number? We have given the Army practically all the money they have asked for aviation. I receive letters every few days from men who want to become flying cadets but who cannot get into the aviation branch.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will answer the question, which is very pertinent. What the Army asked for 6 months ago, when the air force was being formulated, and what they might ask for in the light of present world conditions are, I think, two entirely different matters.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, a year ago there was no need for extraordinary concern; but I think we are now reaching such a point that it would be well-nigh criminal on the part of the Congress of the United States to permit the defense of our country to remain in the condition in which it is in today, and not put on all speed to place this country in adequate condition to defend itself. The people of the country are relying on us, on the committees in the two Houses, on the administration in Washington, on the advice of the Army and Navy, and they assume that we are in a position to defend ourselves.

The truth is that we have only 75,000 soldiers in the Regular Army who tomorrow morning could be used in the event we were to go to war. General Marshall himself has made that statement several times. The mobile fighting force, not the part that is scattered all over the world in garrisons but the actual Army itself, consists today of about 75,000 equipped fighting men, and that is all.

In the light of what is going on all over the world, if anyone supposes that 75,000 men, in a country of 130,000,000 people, is an adequate defense force, in my judgment, he is reckoning without his host.

Mr. President, we do not have many things which are necessary. We do not have the pilots, and airplane pilots are numerous casualties in war. We ought to have about three or four times the number we may actually need.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a moment. It takes a great many trained mechanics to keep a plane in the air. The plane is no good on the ground, and we do not have a sufficient number of trained mechanics on the ground.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with our air situation, I agree with the Senator that we do not now have a sufficient number of trained pilots, and, with our present capacity for training them, there is no probability of training them as fast as we can produce airplanes. A year ago our entire productive capacity in airplanes was 7,000 a year. It has been stepped up, in my judgment, largely because—

Mr. TYDINGS. Because of foreign orders.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because of the repeal of the embargo and the passage of the neutrality act, which permitted the purchase by belligerents of planes made in this country, our capacity to produce airplanes has increased from about 7,000 a year to about 30,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not yet.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the extensions are now in progress.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they are being paid for by foreign nations, by the way, because of the expansions necessary to fill their orders, in cash.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The planes are being paid for in cash, and these expansions will remain the properties of the airplane companies when the war is over, or when these orders cease.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So we have in progress now an increase in our capacity that will take airplane production to around 30,000 a year. But we are not training pilots sufficiently fast to man that many planes. In the Navy we have,

of course, a training school for the naval aviator. We have at Randolph Field, San Antonio, Tex., a sort of bottleneck through which the Army training is concentrated. Kelly Field is also there. Brooks Field is close by. But, when the necessary capacity is reached—and 30,000 a year may not be sufficient, it may ultimately be necessary to step production up to 50,000 a year—what we need if the emergency arises, and when we get these planes, is men who know how to fly them and man them.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I am contending.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that Congress is willing to provide the necessary funds to train men to fly these planes if an emergency of any kind should require it for the defense of our country and of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am not rising particularly to criticize anybody or any branch of the Government at all for the situation we are in at present. Naturally those having the program in charge did not want to spend any more money for military and naval preparation than they felt should be spent, and I can in great degree sympathize with the administration in perhaps not wishing to go any further into that field than it has gone. I am not finding fault, because it would not do any good, in the first place; and, secondly, I have been particeps criminis, as a Member of the Congress, in whatever the situation may be today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment I will yield. But what I want to point out now is that the time for acting like the ostrich has passed. We can no longer dwell under the illusion of safety. We cannot judge what may happen in the future on a mere speculative basis. We have confronting us the grim realities of a European and Asiatic war which is constantly spreading. In addition to that we have the knowledge that at present, whatever we may have assumed 6 months or a year ago, our state of preparedness, our state of defense, is woefully inadequate.

My few remarks today, insofar as they have weight, are directed not so much at the Senate or the House or the administration. They are directed partly to myself; they are directed to the country. We must from now on work hard to put this country in a state of adequate defense, and we need to do it so as to avoid a tremendous and unnecessary loss of human life. Should the awful specter of war ever come again to this country, which I trust it will not, I hope we shall not send to their death men who are poorly trained and poorly equipped, and in another war perhaps risk defeat simply because in our great desire for peace, in our hope that war would not come, in our hope that war would not spread, and in our desire to be a Christian and an upright people, we tarried too long when reality all around us told us it was unwise to tarry further. I am sounding this note today, and I intend to sound it at least once a week until some action is taken to increase our Army.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I agree with him that the day may come when we shall find that we are not training men for aviation with sufficient rapidity. If we were to be plunged into war tomorrow morning, we should find ways to do it. We should go to work on the problem. I do not want to wait until war comes to have that sort of stimulus. I want to prepare men, not for war, but if war comes to us, so that the country will suffer as little loss of human life as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not assume that the Senator was criticizing anybody. It does not lie in the mouth of any of us to criticize anybody else, because national defense is a joint responsibility. We know that every nation which has been overrun or is now being overrun, and every nation which may be overrun in the near future, is in that condition either because it could not or would not see the situation which confronted it. If the foresight of such nations had

been as good as their hindsight now is, they might have been better prepared.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Far away as we are from the conflict, we know that the world has become a small place.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is only a short distance across the oceans. Far away as we think we are and feel we are, and much as we want to remain away from the conflict, it would be stupid on our part to sit idly by and do what other nations have done—wait until the time arrives when the facilities are needed.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only way to guarantee our Nation and our hemisphere against that very thing is to do what the Senator is now advocating.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is exactly correct. Let me rivet my observations with two very pertinent comments:

First, if we prepare now, while we have time, the cost will be about one-half as much in actual money as it will be if we are compelled to prepare without adequate time.

Second, if we prepare now in an orderly way, the job will be better done, and it will be done through the processes of democracy. If we do not prepare now, the plight of this country will be such that we shall have to give up practically all power, and to some extent we shall have to imitate the very forms of government which most persons are now contending are improper.

So, from the standpoint of economy, from the standpoint of political philosophy, and from the standpoint of human safety, it is a good investment for us now to go into this matter thoroughly and do everything we can to bring the state of defense up to a position commensurate with that of our country's problems.

If anyone had said 6 months ago that Norway and Denmark were to be invaded, he would probably have been laughed out of any company as either a warmonger or a man whose judgment was not to be trusted. Many persons did not believe that either Holland or Belgium would be invaded. During the neutrality fight I wrote to my constituents a 14-page letter giving the reasons why I voted for the so-called neutrality bill. I frankly stated that from what I could understand Holland and Belgium would be invaded. It was only a guess on my part, of course. I was no prophet. No one would then agree with me that such a thing was within the realm of possibility.

Today no man knows what the outcome of the war will be. No one can tell whether England and France, on the one hand, will win, or whether Germany, on the other hand, will win. The war may engulf all Europe; it may engulf all Africa; it may engulf all Asia before it is finished. Certainly, I hope it will not. I hope my observations are wild speculation. However, we must begin to think in terms of realities. Wishful thinking is not enough. I have no doubt that the majority of the people in Denmark, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, and Ethiopia, as well as in China, wished, hoped, and prayed that war would not come to them. However, that did not stop it.

The only country which can stay out of war today is the one which has the will to stay out and the force to make attack against it too costly. In the field of reality there is no way for us to meet world conditions short of those two things—first, the desire of our people to stay out; second, the knowledge on the part of any aggressor that it would be too costly and unwise to attack us.

Let me refer to some possibilities. I am not prophesying. I am not saying that these things will happen. However, suppose that a certain nation—I do not wish to mention names—should be the victor in this war. Where would Greenland and Canada go at the peace conference? Who knows? Who will own Canada after the war is over? Will England continue to own it if she loses the war? Who will own Greenland? The thousand miles from Norway to Greenland, with the intervening islands, represent no obstacle. We talk about building a naval base in the Aleutian Islands in

Alaska. Just as good a base could be built in Greenland. Where would we then stand?

We cannot do all these things in 5 minutes. We do know what confronts civilization. We do not know what new pages of history are to be written. We do not know whether or not our own destiny is as secure as we think it is. As my friend and colleague from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said, the oceans are not as wide as they formerly were. There are new weapons, new ingenuity, new daring, new ways of doing things. Invaders no longer come over the sea exclusively. Who would have thought a little group of soldiers could drop by parachute from the air into a city of 800,000 inhabitants, such as Rotterdam, more or less exposed to the view of all the people in that city, and seize an air field, which they hold at this minute?

Where should we put our 75,000 American troops? Should we put them in New York? Should we put them all in Baltimore? Should we have some in Boston, some in Chicago, some in Atlanta, some in Norfolk, and some in Newport News? If we should do so they probably would give a good account of themselves; but in time of war they would certainly not be adequate to protect the people of this country against the possibilities which confront us.

Mr. President, I do not wish to sound a note of great alarm or fear. I do not think we are going to war tomorrow morning. I do not think we shall have to sit up until midnight tonight to start on this problem. However, I do think we ought to commence on it in this Congress, and do the job thoroughly. If we have not a sufficient number of pilots, we should find ways and means to get them. If we have not enough antiaircraft guns, machine guns, Garand rifles, or what not, let us find ways and means of commencing to get them. If we have not a sufficient trained personnel—which we have not—to build airplanes on the scale of 30,000 a year, which Germany is already able to do, let us start to get them. If we have not enough Garand rifles, let us start to get them.

In the light of present conditions, with this country in the situation in which it is so far as national defense is concerned, for the present Congress to adjourn without action on this problem would be a crime against the democracies of the Western Hemisphere and the people of this country. I should like to go home as much as anybody would. I am not trying to be an alarmist; but I hope, in the light of the facts which have appeared on the front pages of newspapers in the past week, that at long last the lethargy, the indifference, and the isolation attitude—the attitude that nothing can happen to us—has ended.

I think the statements of the leaders of our Army and our Navy should begin to register in the consciousness of the American people. Not to prepare is to pay a terrific and unnecessary price in human life and human treasure—money, if you please. Not to prepare is to jeopardize the greatest democracy left today on the face of the earth. No man can tell what the turning of tomorrow's page in history will mean. He may assume; he may wish; but the fact today is that throughout the world the only nation which is safe from attack is the nation which is prepared to resist attack. If it is not prepared to resist attack, in my judgment it is in serious danger. The United States is not at all prepared to meet the problems which have arisen as a result of the happenings of the past 2 or 3 weeks.

Fortunately our Navy, our first line of defense, is perhaps up to a finer state of efficiency and preparedness than is either of its supporting arms, the air force or the Army. Fortunately, during the past 4 or 5 years we have not neglected our Navy. The Navy is our first line of defense. Even so, the air force is a new thing, and I feel that we should immediately address ourselves to this problem, and put the country in a position to meet any possible attack which may perhaps come to us as a result of some future happening.

I desire to reemphasize that it will cost one-half as much if we start at it now as it will cost in a period of great emergency; and I also wish to reemphasize if we do not do it now that a man who could do it in a short space of time will

sweep away all the things we call the institutions of democracy, for it will take little short of a dictatorship to put into action the forces which will have to be put into action if our country should become involved in this war.

I do not want us to become involved in it; I am not advocating that any of this be done for any other reason than the defense of our country. I do not believe that at this time we could serve any good purpose by becoming involved in Europe's war. First of all, we have not anything to fight with except our Navy; we could not take our Army out of the country; there is not enough of it; and, therefore, I hope that my remarks will not be misinterpreted as a warlike speech against any government; but I hope they will be interpreted only as a speech to apprise the people, in some little measure, that we must commence to put this country in a state of defense, and not again permit men to be drafted in time of war and 5 or 6 weeks later be given a rifle, as they were in the last war, and told to "go over the top" in the face of a trained and highly equipped enemy. That would be nothing short of democratic murder, and if we are going to walk that pathway again, I tremble for the stability and future of this Government.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. IV

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. From the Select Committee on Government Organization, I report back adversely Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, disapproving the Reorganization Plan No. IV.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the subject.

The question from now on which I think will be propounded by the Presiding Officer will be on which side of the question does a Senator stand.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 43, which is a highly privileged matter, and I ask that the resolution be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43), which had been reported adversely, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. IV transmitted to Congress by the President on April 11, 1940.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the law which establishes the rule by which the concurrent resolution is to be considered, there is allowed a maximum of 10 hours debate. However, I have conferred with the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, and it has been agreed that we can get along with less time than that. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed not later than 3 o'clock p. m. tomorrow to vote on the final disposition of the pending concurrent resolution.

Mr. McNARY. I shall object at this time, as I desire to give the matter a little further consideration. I will confer about it later, but at this time I object.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Under the law the motion of the Senator from Nevada is a privileged motion, and it is in order for anyone to move to limit the debate, and such motion is not debatable. I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he cares to make such a motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Oregon who says he wants to confer about it, I would not make that motion now.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say that I would prefer an agreement to vote on the matter, and I think we can agree.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say a word as to my understanding of the rule, and I should like to have the attention of the leader and also the attention of the Senator from South Carolina. I should like to be set right as to the matter of parliamentary procedure. If I yield to any Senator or if any other Senator yields to another Senator during the pendency of this question, will not the Chair inquire as to whether or not the Senator to whom the holder of the floor yields is for or against the pending question? I should like to have the rule made clear.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, it seems obvious that the spirit of the rule was to limit debate to the pending question, because the time is divided equally between the two sides. The mere fact that a Senator said he was for or against the resolution, and then went on and made a speech on some other subject, would not, in my judgment, be in conformance with the spirit of the rule. I do not know how the Chair would rule on the question whether or not the debate must be limited to the question, but it seems to me that, inasmuch as the time is divided, it would be within the spirit of the rule to have the debate limited to the question; otherwise, some Senator might get the floor and talk indefinitely on another subject, and thus deprive the side on which he happened to be of any opportunity to discuss the pending question. That is a matter which the Chair probably will have to rule on when the question arises.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the question of whether or not debate is on the resolution is, in my opinion, one of not very great importance. In any event, there is nothing in the rule or in the order under which we are working that limits the debate to the pending resolution. A Senator could speak, in my opinion, on any subject as long as he wanted to. That is the interpretation I have placed on the order. I shall be very glad to have the Chair rule on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The law provides that the time shall be divided. The Chair is not advised as to what Senators will control the time. The Senators controlling the time should know on what subject a Senator to whom they yield a part of the time will speak. That is a matter that will have to be controlled by those who control the debate. The Chair is not in a position to determine the subject Senators may discuss. The Chair should like to be informed as to how the debate is to be controlled.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, I think it might be well to settle that question, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that in the distribution of the time the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] shall control the time on his side and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the chairman of the committee, shall control it in opposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. If that is agreeable to the able Senator from Nevada, I have no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will suggest that this morning we have heard two speeches on the deficiencies of our national defense. Those speeches, if believed, are calculated to scare the people of the country and to cause them to believe that we have nothing in the way of either an Army or Navy or an Air Corps. Some time in the next—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, right there may I say that, holding the floor as I do, I think that during the course of this debate I, for one, will discuss that subject to some extent; but I do not want this uppermost and privileged subject to be interspersed with matters that will take up the time. I say that with the greatest desire to be courteous to every Senator. We have a question to be disposed of; we have a limited time for debate. The law limits it. So can we not proceed under agreement to address ourselves to the all-important subject, which is a privileged question?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a suggestion in the form of a question. My own time is limited.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish merely to say that there are one or two Senators who feel there should have been some reply to what was said this morning, but the Senator from Nevada has precluded that opportunity by taking the floor and imposing this limitation. I repeat there were certain things which should have been said in order that the country might know the inaccuracy of the statements which were made on the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not make and did not impose a limit, the law itself imposes the limit.

Mr. ADAMS. I referred to the Senator taking the floor and making the motion before reply could be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was essential that the matter be brought up, because it was the pending question.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Chair that I will not agree to the control of the time that has been suggested.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry. Mr. President, may I have a parliamentary clarification of the situation? Do I understand that by unanimous consent it was agreed that the Senate would vote at a given hour tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That request was not agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the debate, which is by law limited to 10 hours, be limited to 8 hours.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it. Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is that question subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not subject to debate under the statute. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the debate be limited to 8 hours.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the committee having to do with reorganization has filed an adverse report as to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to file a report?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am wondering about the parliamentary situation. I do not want to lose the floor, and I do not want to take up time. I should like to be courteous to every Senator; but we have here an entirely new question as to which the procedure seems to be fixed by a new statute, and I am trying to conform to the statute.

Mr. WALSH. I have no desire to interfere with the Senator's remarks; merely to submit a committee report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry, and I hope the Senator will pardon me.

The opening addresses of this morning—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that under the present parliamentary arrangement the Senator from Nevada may now occupy the entire 8 hours if he so desires?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not the situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the law provides that the time must be equally divided. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Nevada, being on one side of the question, will have not to exceed 4 hours.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think that in a very short time the leader or the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and I will agree as to a division of time. I am entirely willing to agree now.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, under the motion the Senator has made, the law provides that one-half of the time shall be consumed by those in favor of the resolution, and the other half of the time shall be consumed by those opposed to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BYRNES. So it is not necessary to have an agreement. The Senator has one-half of the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, again reverting to the subject very ably discussed today by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] it has been demonstrated beyond peradventure of a doubt that there is now no military agency in the control of man more effective for defense or offense than the agency of the air. I say without fear of contradiction that it has been established in Europe up to this hour that an independent control of air facilities in any nation is the paramount thing. Only 48 hours ago it was reported over the radio that there was such a division of power in Great Britain that when the air forces under control of political agencies in Great Britain sought to attack in Norway, instead of acting in cooperation with the naval forces they were compelled to telephone or telegraph to London for authority.

An independent agency, free from political entanglements, has been the greatest agency that any nation has ever owned; and, looking to that point of view, looking to that thought, and with that in mind, the Congress of the United States was far ahead of any other country in the world when in 1938 it passed the bill establishing the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Immediately you say to me, "What has civil aeronautics to do with military aeronautics?" Today civil aeronautics is the greatest adjunct of military aeronautics. Why? Because with one command, with one word today issued by the Civil Aeronautics Authority every single airship in America and every air line will immediately become an enlisted agency to transport men and facilities for air defense from one coast to another in a country which extends 3,500 miles from coast to coast.

How much better will we be if we stand by the studies that we made over 5 years, which studies finally produced the Civil Aeronautics Authority, rather than to throw this adjunct into the confusion of a new set-up in a new authority in a new condition, whence it emerged in disaster in 1938?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator undoubtedly is familiar with the fact that the President of the United States himself has corroborated the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada as to the importance of civil aviation in connection with national defense when he said, in his letter to the National Aviation Forum of January 24, 1939:

Civil aviation is clearly recognized as the backlog of national defense in the Civil Aeronautics Act, which set up the effective machinery for a comprehensive national policy with respect to the air.

Precisely bearing out the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator. I have had in mind this fact, because it was not without consultation with the President that the Civil Aeronautics Act was written. It was not without consultation with the President—this very President, if you please, whom the Senator from Missouri and I supported on two occasions to become the President of the United States—that the Civil Aeronautics Act was written. Not once but four different times were we called into consultation, so that the act might be the very thing which he, in the statement read by the Senator from Missouri, declared it to be, namely, the backlog of national defense.

Are we going to burn that log now? Are we going to destroy it now? Are we going to set it into the chaos of a new surrounding? We know what it has done. Shall we destroy that? Shall we say to the world, "Yes; we know what our civil aviation has done; nevertheless, we are going to try a new experiment with it"?—and, indeed, an experiment it would be; an experiment with a history so emphatic that we should not even for a moment consider it, because that experiment is one that has cost the lives of hundreds of passengers and hundreds of pilots.

Go back to the old regime? Go back to the age and the hour of human destruction? Go back to the thing that caused Congress to create the investigating committee which cost thousands of dollars? Go back to the condition that made aviation in America a thing that many would not invest their money in; that many would not travel on; that no agency seemed to be able to control?

After our coordinate House on the other side of this building has voted, by an overwhelming vote, not to go along with the Executive order, I am not ready to believe that the Senate of the United States, with all of its history, with its origination of the present civil aeronautics plan, with its observation of success through the years, is now going to vote that success out of existence; and I hope no man or set of men will have the temerity to say, "If you do not do this you are not supporting the administration." Such an absurd statement is beyond the pale of human decency, because it was this administration which gave rise to the present law. It was the President of the United States who gave rise to the most efficient law on the subject of aviation that has been put on the statute books up to this hour; and now to say that we are not going along with the President when we refuse to recede from our position is a mere absurdity.

Mr. President, who is advocating the destruction of the law which Congress passed? Who is calling upon Congress to destroy its own handiwork? Are the people doing it? Is there, in this country today, any group of people who seek to destroy this law, and to put the Civil Aeronautics Authority into a new agency? Will some Senator within the sound of my voice name that group of people? Where are they? What do they stand for? Who are they? Can their names be put upon the record of the Congress? I doubt it. Is any agency seeking this new—if I may so term it—legislation? Let us see. If we are going down to dollars and cents, who has the greatest amount invested in the great art and science of civil aviation? Let me say to you that during the present year the air lines have borrowed \$25,000,000 to go forward with air-line activities under the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Let me say to you that they may borrow \$25,000,000 more to go forward with their work.

Are they seeking to destroy the law which has been in effect since 1938? In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be found resolutions passed by every air line in the United States, perhaps with one small exception, some little line which I have not in mind. Every major air line in the United States has passed a resolution against Reorganization Plan No. IV and in favor of the concurrent resolution now pending, known as Concurrent Resolution No. 43. So there is the industry, with all of its invested capital, with all the money it has borrowed, with all of the lenders of that money, if they count for anything, asking the Senate of the United States to stand by its guns to the end, that the law enacted by the Congress shall remain the law in this all-important hour, when these people are investing every cent of their capital and when they are borrowing more so as to invest more. So that group wants the law to remain as it is.

Then let us turn to those who carry more on their shoulders than any group which is at all interested in this subject. Let us consider the men who must die first when a crash occurs, the men who seldom survive to tell the tale when an airplane goes down. Today they are walking the streets of Washington, they are in the Halls of Congress, they are wearing their uniforms of honor, in righteous indignation at the idea that that which would preserve their lives, that that which has preserved their lives for over a year, shall even for a moment be marked as a subject for destruction.

They have been typified as the "lobby to save human lives." Rather sarcastically was that expression used, I am sorry to say. But they are not the only lobby which seems to be working here; and if they be a lobby to save human lives, then God is with them, man is with them, the people are with them, and the industry is with them.

Why destroy this agency now? Because the press of a country wants it destroyed? I have here at my hand what constitutes a volume of clippings, and I have them alphabetically arranged by States. I shall not attempt to put all of

these into the RECORD, but I do intend to read the captions of some of them. They are not mere comments; they are editorials from the papers in the respective States of this country.

Alabama has made her contribution. The Birmingham Post, under date of April 18, contained an editorial under the headline, "No Retreat on Aviation." This is a splendid editorial on the subject.

Again, in Sheffield, Ala., the Tri Cities Daily, of date April 19, had the headline, "Hill-Sparkman Bill is Sound." It deals with the very subject we have before us.

Again, there is the Gadsden (Ala.) Times of April 16, containing a splendid editorial. The Gadsden (Ala.) Times on April 11 again contained an editorial under the title, "President Asks New Program of Reorganization."

Again, the Huntsville (Ala.) Times contains comment under the caption of the Washington Merry-Go-Round.

Again, the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal of April 16 contains an editorial under the caption "Civil Aeronautics."

All of these are speaking from the State of Alabama.

Then we come to the State of Arkansas, and under the caption, "Aviation Menaced by the New Order," we have a most outstanding editorial, together with a number of others which I will not take the time to put into the RECORD.

We then come to California, and under the caption "Aviation and Politics" the Los Angeles Times contains a denunciatory editorial against the proposed change in the law.

The San Jose Mercury Herald of April 17 publishes an editorial headed "Order Criticized," dealing with aviation and the proposed change.

The San Diego Union, under date of April 13, contained an editorial under the headline "A Reorganization Blunder."

Then we come to Colorado. Under date of April 13, 1940, the Rocky Mountain News says, "No Retreat on Aviation."

The Chieftain, of Pueblo, Colo., has an editorial under the headline "Renewed Attempt by President to Get Reorganization Powers Meets Opposition." It deals with the subject most intelligibly.

We then come to Connecticut, and the Bulletin, published in Norwich, Conn., on April 13 contained an editorial under the headline "A Blow at Success," dealing with the subject of civil aeronautics and denouncing the proposed change.

Then the Hartford (Conn.) Courant contained an editorial under the heading "Altering the C. A. A.," denunciatory of any attempt to destroy the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram contained an editorial under the headline "Safety and Reorganization," again drawing the attention of Congress to the idea that the law it enacted should not be destroyed by an agency.

The Hartford (Conn.) Courant of April 23 published an editorial headed "For Safety in the Air," praising and commending the present law, denouncing the effort to set it aside.

The Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., under the headline "Why Not Leave it Alone," dated April 17, contains a most comprehensive editorial.

Now we come to Florida, a State much interested in aviation, and I find an editorial under the headline "C. C. A." of date April 13, from the News of Miami.

Again, the News of Miami, Fla., of April 14 contains an editorial headlined "Suggestion," dealing with the subject of aviation, and denouncing the C. A. A. being transferred to another agency.

Again, the Miami News of April 23 contained an editorial under the caption "Dangerous Missetp," denouncing the idea of destroying the Civil Aeronautics Authority by putting it into a political agency.

Then we come to the State of Georgia. The Telegraph and News of Macon, Ga., of date April 21, 1940, published an editorial under the caption "Pilots Plead for Safety," dealing with the subject of the pilots of the United States being here in Congress asking that the present Civil Aeronautics Authority should continue to exist as it is.

Again, the Telegram of Macon, Ga., under date of April 26, 1940, contains an editorial under the caption "Protesting a New Peril." In other words, this paper sees the return of

the Civil Aeronautics to a political agency as being a peril, and denounces the proposed transfer.

In the State of Idaho we find an editorial from the Twin Falls Times dealing with the same subject and in the same way.

Then we come to the State of Iowa. Its press has been filled with editorials denouncing the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, an independent agency, to a political agency.

In the State of Kansas, the State so ably represented here, we find in the Kansas City Traveler of April 22, 1940, an able editorial under the caption "Keep the C. C. A. As It Is."

Then we come to the State of Kentucky, the State so ably represented by the leader of the majority in this body. We find the Sun Democrat issuing an editorial under the caption, "Economy in Government Not Easily Gained," dealing with the Civil Aeronautics Authority commendatorily, and denouncing the proposed change.

I have any number of articles coming from several papers in Kentucky, and if I should put them all into the RECORD I would be censured for utilizing all the space of the RECORD. These comments come from the State represented by the able leader of the majority on this side.

Then we go to Louisiana. The New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, under date of April 22, asks "Shall the C. A. A. Continue?" lauding the record of the C. A. A., denouncing the proposed transfer.

The New Orleans (La.) Item, under date of April 23, under the caption "Air-Traffic Control," issued a splendid editorial commending the present Authority, denouncing the proposed transfer.

Then we come to the State of Maryland. Mr. President, the matters I have been referring to are all editorials. They are not merely news comments. They are thoughts expressed by those who have in charge the editorial guidance of the press.

The Evening Sun of Baltimore, of date April 13, carries an editorial under the caption "Messing It Up." It calls attention to the awful mess that will result if the Civil Aeronautics Authority is put into a political agency. It deals with the record which has been made by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and denounces its proposed destruction.

Then we come to Massachusetts. The Evening Union of Springfield, under date of April 16, carries an editorial under the caption "Reorganization," in which it commends the law passed by Congress creating the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and praises its record of performance, and its ability to perform and denounces its destruction.

The Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., in an editorial of April 17 under the caption "C. A. A. Should be Preserved," extols and commends the work of the C. A. A. and denounces its transfer.

Then we come to Worcester, Mass. The Worcester Gazette of April 18 carries an editorial under the caption "C. A. A. is Being Kicked Around," in which it denounces the policy that would do that very thing.

Then we have the Mercury of New Bedford, Mass., of date April 19, which carries an editorial under the caption "Opposes Reorganization."

The Transcript of North Adams, Mass., under date of April 26 carries an editorial under the caption "Not so Shrewd," which again denounces the policy of change.

The Boston Herald, under date of April 20, carries an editorial under the caption "Monkeying With C. A. A."

All these editorials, Mr. President, and more, we draw to the attention of the Senate.

Again we have an editorial printed in the Free Press of Detroit. The State of Michigan, through its editorial writers and in various newspapers has been heard in denunciation of the proposed change. The Free Press says, "Change Would Be a Calamity." The editorial denounces the transfer of the C. A. A., and demands that it remain an independent agency.

Again we have the Saginaw News of April 22, which prints an editorial under the caption "No Place for Politics." The editorial in that splendid newspaper denounces the

idea of the execution of this law being placed in a political agency.

Then we have the Detroit Times of date April 23, which prints an editorial under the caption "Keep Aviation Law," dwelling on the subject of what has been accomplished under the aviation law as it is now written, and what might be the result if it is destroyed.

Then we have the News of Saginaw, Mich., under date of April 22, carrying an editorial under the caption "No Place for Politics." It deals with the subject in a manner similar to that of other editorials.

We have an editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald, of date April 25, under the caption "Aviation Resents It." It is a long editorial, comprising almost a full column in length, which denounces the proposed change.

Then we come to the State of Minnesota. The Winona (Minn.) Republican-Herald of April 24, 1940, carries an editorial under the caption "Flying and Reorganization." It supports the principle I am advocating here, namely, that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which has accomplished so much, shall not be destroyed.

Again we have an editorial from the Tribune, of Minneapolis, of date April 24, under the caption "Safety in the Air," dealing with the subject quite at length. It denounces the change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority as it is now constituted, to any agency of the Government.

We come now to the State of Missouri. The Kansas City Star, of date April 15, carries an editorial under the caption "Spinach or Snap Judgment?" It deals with the expression which was made, I am sorry to say, some weeks ago, in which this subject was dealt with so lightly as to be called "spinach." The editorial deals with the subject in a strong, forceful way, denouncing the idea of a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to a political agency of the Government.

Then we have an editorial in the Star-Times of St. Louis, of date April 22, 1940, under the caption "A Blunder in Reorganization." This is an editorial which strikes squarely and decisively at the idea of the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, from being an independent agency, to one controlled by politics.

We have an editorial printed in the Kansas City Times, of date April 22, under the caption "Think Again, Mr. President." The editorial denounces the idea of the transfer of this agency to the Department of Commerce or any other department.

Then we have an editorial printed in the St. Louis Post Dispatch, of April 22, under the caption "But Is it Spinach?" dealing with the subject quite at length, and denouncing the change.

Then we come to the State of Minnesota, and we have an editorial published in the Helena (Mont.) Independent, of date April 17. The editorial is ably written by the editor of that newspaper under the caption "Not All Spinach." The editorial again deals with the subject of the transfer, and denounces the idea of transferring the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present independent position.

Under date of April 19, an editorial is published in the Helena (Mont.) Independent, under the caption "Severity For Safety." The editorial deals with the subject of safety at length. It commends the Civil Aeronautics Authority for its splendid record made up to date. It hopes that nothing will transpire which will take the Civil Aeronautics Authority out of its present independent control.

Then we have an editorial from the Journal, of Lincoln, Neb., under date of April 23. It is an able editorial under the caption, "Reorganization Protest." The editor of that great newspaper denounces the idea of a change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present position to one of obscurity.

Mr. President, if I were to put into the RECORD, or even name the articles that appear in the press of these respective States, I would be criticized for taking up too much space in the RECORD. I am now dealing with editorial comments, nothing more.

We come to the State of New Jersey. The Bergen Record, of Hackensack, carries an editorial under the caption,

"Changes." In that editorial it denounces the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The press of the State of New Jersey carries a number of articles on the subject. Every one we have had an opportunity to see denounces the proposed change, and calls it revolutionary and destructive.

Then we come to the State of New Mexico. The Albuquerque Tribune of date April 19, carries an editorial under the caption, "No Retreat on Aviation." It draws the attention of the people to what may be a decisive retreat if we destroy this agency which has accomplished so much.

I draw the attention of the Senate to the press of New Mexico, and I might draw the attention of the Senate to the press of every State of the Union if I saw fit, and thereby express to the Senate what is the view of the press of this country.

We now come to the State of New York. The New York Times of April 13, under the caption, "Shifting the C. A. A.," denounces the idea of destroying this independent agency.

The Palladium-Times, of Oswego, N. Y., in an editorial dated April 13, under the caption, "Business and Weather," draws attention to what has been accomplished by the C. A. A., and denounces the proposed change.

Next we have the Star-Gazette, of Elmira, N. Y., under date of April 16, under the caption, "Vigilance Necessary," lauding the work of the C. A. A., and denouncing the proposed change.

A copy of the New York Times editorial under the caption, "Shifting the C. A. A.," is published approvingly by the Glens Falls Times under date of April 15.

The Union-Star, of Schenectady, N. Y., under date of April 17, published an editorial entitled, "Too Much Delegation of Power," denouncing the proposed change.

The morning Wall Street Journal of April 18 contains an editorial entitled "An Indefensible Merger," denouncing the change proposed by the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV.

The Schenectady Union-Star of April 19, under the caption "Yesterday's Best Editorial, Why Repeat a Mistake?" denounces the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present admirable position and condition to that of a political agency.

The Times-Record of Troy, N. Y., under date of April 22, in an editorial under the caption "No Political Domination," denounces the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to a political agency.

The New York Journal-American of April 22 contains an editorial under the caption "A Blow at the Aviation Industry."

Let me say, Mr. President, that no greater blow was ever struck at an industry than is being struck by the President's Reorganization Plan No. IV; and no greater effort was ever made to save an industry and a great independent facility than we are trying to make by Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Under the heading "A Blow at the Aviation Industry," the New York Journal-American denounces in no uncertain terms the idea of changing the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present position to that of a political agency.

The Telegram, of Malone, N. Y., under date of April 22, deals with the subject under the heading "Domestic Issues Vital."

The Star-Gazette, of Elmira, N. Y., under date of April 22, discusses the matter under the heading "Domestic Issues Vital." Each of these editorials deals with the subject very much at length.

The New York Herald Tribune of April 26, under the caption "Keep the C. A. A. Independent," deals with the subject more drastically, perhaps, than any other.

The Union-Star, of Schenectady, N. Y., under date of April 17, deals with the subject under the caption "Too Much Delegation of Power."

The Buffalo Evening News of April 22 contains an editorial under the caption "Politics in Aviation."

In all these editorials, and more, the press of the great Empire State of New York denounces Reorganization Plan No.

IV and extols the effort being made to save the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. President, if I were to go further with the voice of the press of America, I could only add to what I was trying to say at the outset. The people of America have denounced the proposed change from the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. I challenged any Senator to state the name of a group of persons in America who wanted the proposed change, and there was not a single response. I repeat the challenge, because I have been unable to find any such group.

I also asked if there was a single industry in America which desired the change. I referred to the fact that the industry now striving to go forward with civil aviation has borrowed \$50,000,000 or more in order to go forward with this great industry. The aviation industry does not want the change. Its representatives are asking that the change shall not come about.

Mr. President, on my desk I have editorial comments from every State. I shall refer to some of them later. Each one of them denounces any change in the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. President, an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 30 has just come to my attention. The editorial is entitled "Advance of Aviation Industry Depends Upon Congress' Action Now." That editorial, coming from a great newspaper of the West, recites the history of the effort which was made to make civil aviation an independent agency which would accomplish something, and then recites the fact of the accomplishment. The editorial then sounds the warning, in no uncertain terms, that if civil aviation is again thrown into chaos and confusion we do not know where such action will lead.

Mr. President, two speeches were made in the Senate today which support my position. So far as I am concerned, they were unexpected. One was by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], whose view on the subject seems to me to be indeed sound. The other was by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Other Senators contributed observations; but those two speeches in particular lay a groundwork for my position today in resisting the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority into a political agency. The arguments of the two Senators to whom I refer are so much more cogent than anything I could say that I draw their remarks to my support.

Mr. President, if there ever was a time when this country should cease political activity and look to its defense, to avoid letting the blood of the youth of America, this is the hour and this is the time. This is no time to quibble over what Mr. Smith, of the Bureau of the Budget, may think or conjecture. It is time to deal with facts which have been established by an unblemished record.

Let us go forward with safety while we have it. Let us go forward with an American agency builded by an American Congress over a period of years, when America was seeking to lead the world in civil aeronautics, so that Columbia might boast of ruling the air as Britannia boasts of ruling the waves. We are in that position now. Shall we resign from that place? Shall we tear down the structure which Congress has built? Shall we say that we shall relinquish our thought, our ideas, and our study to someone who deals in conjecture?

Mr. President, if the Civil Aeronautics Authority has worked effectively up to date, why will it not work effectively from now on, at least until the clouds of trouble shall have passed away, at least until the dissipating and destructive thought of war shall have gone from us? No agency of national defense is more powerful than aeronautics. There is no way of training a pilot in the air more effectively than to train him to carry human beings from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. President, scathing ridicule has been hurled at a group of young men who have come to Washington. They have been called a lobby to save lives. I hope some Senators have met them. They are fine men. They are the men who sit at the controls of the ships of the air, which carry our

friends and families across the land and over the water. They are here pleading that the law shall remain as it is. Every man of them is a trained warrior, subject to his country's call at a moment's notice in time of war. Every one of them knows the terrain of America. Every one of them knows the air currents. Every one of them knows the rules. They are soldiers in civilian uniforms, ready to go. They have been trained by an industry. Their training has been made possible by a law. They occupy their present positions by reason of the training which was given to them at the expense of private industry, costing the Government not a single cent.

Let the civil aviation industry go forward in America. For God's sake, do not destroy it now, when it is seeking to uphold our national existence by offering to pay the tax which we may call upon it to pay to protect us in an hour of need. Do not destroy or discourage this industry, which is willing to borrow and borrow and borrow to the end that it may build and build and build for national defense, without a single dollar coming out of the National Treasury to support it, except for carrying the mails. Little by little, the rates for carrying the mails are being reduced.

Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I had hoped we might have a little more definite understanding as to a division of time. I know there was an opportunity, and I hope the Senator will not consider me as being at all critical, but would the Senator care to enter into an arrangement that the proponents of the resolution may have the opening and closing? That seems to me to be not an unreasonable suggestion.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there was objection to any agreement as to control of the time. I did not have anything to do with the proposal. The Senator from Kentucky made it, but there is now no way by which anyone can control the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to continue for a short time with the subject I have in mind, in order that the discussion may be completed, and not broken into.

I have just had handed to me an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, of Milwaukee, Wis., of date April 23, under the caption "Keep air authority independent." I did not have that editorial mounted in my volume which I shall always retain as a memento of a great event, so that I have to read it separate from the bound volume which I have here at my desk.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the Senator familiar with the one instance in which a publisher of a newspaper very closely affiliated with a certain Government agency wrote a flaming editorial against the President's reorganization plan, and just a couple of days later turned up in Washington trying to influence his Congressman to vote in favor of the reorganization plan?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes; I have heard of that incident. It was an isolated incident, but it was forceful nevertheless, and gave evidence of certain conditions which prevail at this hour.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When it comes down to the question of lobbying, does not the Senator think that the suggestions and the urgings of men who every day take in their hands their lives and the lives of their passengers ought to be given more weight than the wishes of the R. F. C.?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should think so; but, then, in the changing hour and the drastic force that is being put forward to defeat this resolution, I never know what may happen.

From the State of Virginia I have, from the Petersburg Progress Index, an editorial of date April 18 under the caption "A Reorganization Faux Pas," denunciatory of the move to change the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present independent position to a political position.

I have in my hand an editorial coming from the Virginian Pilot, of Norfolk, Va., of date April 15, under the caption "Why Change Aviation Control?" dealing with the same subject in very much of a similar way.

I have in my hand a recent series of editorials from the State of Texas; one from the Brownsville Herald of date April 20, entitled "Don't Shoot the Watchdog"—a startling headline, very much apropos to the subject—which deals with the disastrous effects prior to the establishment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the results of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and what may follow if that independent agency is destroyed.

I have in my hand an editorial from the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of date April 17, under the caption "Keep the Civil Aeronautics Authority independent," dealing with the subject very much at length; and I hope the Senators, as they listen to me, may look at the length of these editorials. The editorials I have mentioned today are not mere casual, off-hand expressions. They are editorials which evince thought and study, resolution and determination on the part of the editors who speak for the people in their respective communities. They are editorials representative of the editorial thought of America, and each one of them that I have referred to here today denounces the change.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Texarkana Gazette of April 13, under the caption "Penalizing Efficiency," which deals with the subject of the destruction of an efficient independent agency and its placing in a political agency of the Government.

I have an editorial from the San Antonio (Tex.) Express, under the caption "Let the C. A. A. and the Air Safety Board Alone," another emphatic expression; and again I draw the attention of the Senate to the length of these articles coming from the pens of editors who have important matters to think about and deal with. They are not merely flimsy expressions which pass away with the moment. They are expressions which signify thought and resolution.

Again, I have in my hand an editorial from the El Paso Herald-Post, under the caption "Air Authority Shift," dealing with the subject somewhat at length.

Then, Mr. President, we come again to the great State of Tennessee. I have in my hand an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar, of date April 23, under the caption "No Retreat on Aviation." I hope the good Senators from Tennessee may listen to me and consider that editorial. It deals with the subject thoughtfully, resolutely, and emphatically.

Again, I have in my hand an editorial from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., of date April 23, entitled "Stick

to the C. A. A.," a very emphatic expression dealing with the subject from a comprehensive point of view.

Again, I have in my hand an editorial from the Nashville Banner, of date April 20, 1940, entitled "Pilots Protest Justly." I do not know whether or not the attention of that group of fine boys who came to Washington to protest for the welfare of their lives and the lives of the passengers who ride under their control, was brought to an editorial of that kind, but there is an editorial which supports their position, because they do protest justly; and who has more right to protest? Who knows air conditions and the industry of aviation better than the pilot who flies above the clouds and has anywhere from 10 to 40 human lives under his control? Who knows the strain of that responsibility better than does that pilot, who knows that not only his own life but the lives of his fellow beings and the lives of his industry are in his hands? When they come here wearing their uniform of honor—although it has been sarcastically dealt with—when they come here pleading with the Senate of the United States not to change this law, they have behind them something more than mere personal, whimsical desire. They have behind them something more than a desire for personal power, because not one of them knows what political power is. All they know is the power to do, at a moment of emergency, what their training has given them a knowledge of doing. They are not dealing with politics. They are dealing with industry; they are dealing with human lives; they are dealing with a progressive movement in America which spells more than all the political agencies in the world. Yes; "Pilots Protest Justly," an apt editorial from the Nashville Banner.

Then I have here, from the Journal of Knoxville, Tenn., an editorial, of date April 23, under the caption "We'd Say Leave it Alone"; in other words, another expression demanding that the Congress of the United States, which has before it a record of achievement, leave alone the agency which brought about that achievement, and take no chances on the conjecture of a Director of the Bureau of the Budget who knows as much about aviation as a Hindu knows about skates.

Then we have from South Dakota an editorial from the Rapid City Journal dated April 23 entitled "Turning the Clock Back." Observe the length of this editorial, and reflect on the thought of the editor that was put into it. It is not a mere expression, not a passing fancy with him. He was seeking to do for his country and for his State and his cause something which would be worth while. He was trying to give to his country an expression, through the columns of his paper, which might reach the eyes and ears and attention of those who are interested in one of America's great industries and great achievements. He was trying to write a message to the world, to America, and to the Congress, which would sink deep into the hearts of his readers. Under the caption "Turning Back the Clock," he dealt with the history of aviation, and dwelt on the things which would be accomplished by leaving well enough alone.

Then there is from the Lead (S. Dak.) Call, of April 23, 1940, under the caption, "C. A. A. Hit" a very pointed, sharp editorial which deals with the subject, and denounces the proposed change.

Then from the State of Rhode Island I have in my hand an editorial from the Newport News, of April 23, 1940, under the caption "Air Safety." Again I draw the attention of the Senate to the thought that is put into these editorials, to the development of the thought, and to the time it took for these editors to put out these independent expressions. Let no one say that there is anyone on the side of the question from which I speak now who has the power to go into the respective States and bring from the editorial columns expressions of confidence or expressions of denunciation such as I have read to the Senate today. We strive because we believe our cause is just, and in that justice we are thrice armed, and if there come to our aid and our comfort such expressions from the editorial pens of the press of America, so much the more are we resolved to go forward, because we know that thinking men of America, men who are independent, without regard to political affiliations, are speaking on and of and about this

subject, not mere expressions, but editorials reaching the length of whole columns and double columns, dealing with a subject which is uppermost in the mind of every American who thinks of war today, and, thinking of war, wants our aviation facilities to be out of political control. He wants aviation to be and to go forward under an independent agency, so that when the time comes if this Nation—and God forbid—should be called upon to defend itself, it can call upon an Army of trained boys who guided human life, the most precious cargo in the world, across the continent, over the waters, over the mountains, above the clouds, and landed them safely without a single loss of life in a year, with 86,000,000 plane-miles flown and 814,000,000 passenger-miles flown in that year. That test alone should commend this agency to the Senate of the United States above any lobbying which can be brought to bear, above any steam roller which can be brought to bear, above any command for personal courtesies to be extended to anyone.

Mr. President, in this matter there are no personal courtesies to be extended. This is country, this is God, this is liberty, this is freedom, this is democracy, not politics, or personal courtesies. Nor is it a question of whether your State or mine will get some particular advantage. That is not the question. It is not a personal matter, and I hope it never will be.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have been unable to find any editorials or writings attacking the Safety Board. These editorials are unanimous, or very nearly so, are they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I know, they are unanimous. Perhaps I have not been able to get the editorial expression of every paper in the United States, but I have tried to get the opinions of as many as I could, and I find a unanimity running through them all. I will deal with the Safety Board in a few moments.

Mr. LUNDEEN. As one Member of the Senate, I appreciate the magnificent and able fight the distinguished Senator from Nevada is making, and I have found the corps of pilots who have come to Washington, that group, the men of aviation, unanimously behind the Senator in the position he has taken. They are enthused, I wish to say, for the Senator's encouragement, over his stand, and the warrior spirit he always shows in any just cause which he chooses to espouse.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota. I am grateful. I feel that I am battling in a just cause, for my country. I am not battling for a single advantage for myself. There is not one employee of the Civil Aeronautics Authority who holds his position on my recommendation. So that I battle for nothing that is personal. But I think that personalities and personal advantage should be laid aside at this hour, and that our country should come first.

Mr. President, I have in my hand from the great State of Pennsylvania, an editorial from the Philadelphia Record, under date of April 21, under the caption, "Why trifle with the Air Safety Bureau," again denouncing the proposed change.

Again, from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, I have an editorial dated April 17 entitled "Air Safety Not 'Spinach' to Flying Public." That is a striking caption, "Air Safety Not 'Spinach' to Flying Public." The subject may be "spinach" to some people, but to those who go into a plane to travel from one end of the country to the other, and desire to come off the plane alive, air transport is not "spinach," notwithstanding the fact that it may have been so typified.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Allentown (Pa.) Call, dated April 20, under the caption "Keep Air Control Out of Politics." Again I draw the attention of the Senate to the length of the editorial, as of every one I have used.

I have from the Pittsburgh Press an editorial, dated April 18 under the caption "No Retreat on Aviation." I may

say in this respect that for us to adopt Reorganization Plan No. IV, for us to vote down Concurrent Resolution 43, would be a decisive retreat. It took the Senate 5 long years; it took the writing of 21 bills; it took the presentation of some 10 or 12 bills; before a conference committee, after months of study, finally adopted the present law, which is today as clear as the noonday sun. Those who say it is an involved law, or hard to administer, or confused, simply do not know what the law is; they have not read it; they have not seen it; and they do not understand it. It has not been confusing to an Authority which accomplished results in 12 months. There has not been any confusion there. Human life has been saved, and there is never confusion where that is accomplished. So, when this editor says, "No retreat on aviation," I adopt that as a slogan, because there should be no retreat from what is right and just.

I hold in my hand an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, of April 18, under the caption "Supervision of Aviation Should Not Be Transferred to Commerce Department."

Mr. President, again I draw the attention of the Senate to the length of the editorial. It is not an editorial which came out of a passing thought; it was studiously written, and ably and forcefully put forth.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Dispatch-Herald, of Erie, Pa., dated April 20, under the caption "Keep Politics Out," again denouncing the proposed change of the Civil Aeronautics Authority from its present independent position to a place in another department, and especially the Department of Commerce in which it has no place.

From the State of Oklahoma I have in my hand an editorial from the Shawnee Evening Star, dated April 16, under the caption "Save the C. A. A." It is an appeal from an editor; it is an appeal from an independent American; it is an appeal from a man whose pen would lead the Congress of the United States to listen to the voice of humanity in this great struggle; it is an appeal to save something which the Senate created; it is an appeal that in the hour of need we not destroy something that has accomplished so much. So he says, "Save the C. A. A."

Then I have in my hand an editorial from the Shawnee (Okla.) News, of date April 17, under the caption "Save the C. A. A."

Mr. President, this is the voice of the press, the voice of the people, to which I have referred. No Senator has told me here on the floor today, although I have called for the statement twice, that any people or group of people requested this change. No one has asked for this change in all the length and breadth of the country. I have not been able to find a single editorial expression favoring the change. Neither have I found one single member of the industry in America, comprising that great line of airships which supplies transportation facilities for the country, asking for the change.

Mr. President, who asks for this change? Who wants to destroy the accomplishment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority? Certainly it could not have been the President, because the President extolled the Civil Aeronautics Authority, not once, but three different times. He referred to its marvelous work, under which he said 500,000,000 miles have been flown without a fatality. He might today say 814,000,000 miles have been flown without a fatality. So it is not the President who is calling for this disastrous change.

Those who are saying "Uphold the hands of the President" are looking to the wrong source, because the President has said that the Civil Aeronautics Authority is the backbone of American defense. He did not say that it should be in the Department of Commerce then, and he was speaking in the not-far-distant past.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Evidently the President has changed his mind very materially in the last 11 months, which comprises a portion of the period during which there

have been no accidents on air lines in the United States, because just about 11 months ago I made a speech—not in the Senate, but outside the Senate—in which I adverted to the number of employees of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and that the Authority complained because it had taken over too many of the employees in the Commerce Department. The President wrote me a letter and took me to task, not questioning the accuracy of my figures, but taking me to task for quoting those figures as to the personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in view of the great work the Authority had been doing.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am glad to have that expression. It is in keeping with history.

Mr. President, let me be a little frank here. The law was not written in a minute. Five years' work was put into the writing of this law. I will speak only from the record of this very body. When the junior Senator from Nevada first presented a bill to make the Civil Aeronautics Authority an independent agency, and to take the whole affair out of the Post Office Department, and out of the Commerce Department, and out of the I. C. C., Senators will recall that the President sent down a message in which he said he wanted all transportation facilities under one body, namely, the I. C. C. And so, with that in mind, Congress voted down my bill.

Then a conference with the President led me to write the bill again, providing that it all be placed in the I. C. C., and to make it conform to the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the President by his message desired. Then, Senators will recall that the bill was killed here in the Senate because the Post Office Department was ardently opposed to it. The Post Office Department did not want the agency transferred out of the Post Office Department into the Interstate Commerce Commission, and so the measure died again.

And then—there is no secret about this, it is common knowledge—I had the privilege of being called to the White House, and the statement was made to me, "I think you were right in one instance. Now go back and write your bill over again." He then gave me some suggestions, every one of which was carried in the bill that is now the law. There are Senators here who know the truth of my statement. So I rewrote the bill to conform to the views of the President, and brought it back into the Senate. And that able Representative from California wrote a companion bill, and we came together in the conference committee and worked out a workable, feasible, uniform, and unified law, which has worked so well that even the President, the Members of Congress, the members of the Department, and the world at large, if you please, have commented on it, have commended the law.

Now who wants to destroy it? It was Omar who said:

Ne'er a peevish boy

Would break the bowl from which he drank in joy.

The bill was created with the thought and collaboration of the President. This is the President's bill. I am willing to resign any credit that might come to the author of the measure. It came out with his approval and approbation, and after he had studied it. It has worked well.

Mr. President, not the people, not the press, not the industry, not the pilots, not any agency that we know of or that anyone has designated has demanded this agency's destruction.

Yet you are told here that as a matter of courtesy to someone you should support him. You are told that if it is not carried out the way they want it, it will be too bad for you. You are being told many things, I am sorry to say. But, after all, the question of justice and fair play is before us, and a law that is worth while is being defended to the best of our humble ability.

Mr. President, I can only conclude these remarks of today with one wish and one expression that comes from the heart, and that is that those who worked with me to produce this accomplishment will not now work to destroy their own handiwork.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the action of President Roosevelt in submitting his fourth plan on Government reorganization, and particularly the part of the plan which would transfer the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce, is a demonstration of unusual courage. I suppose in all the country, and taking all things into account, there is no man better informed on the science of government than the present President of the United States. He knew, I am sure, that his proposal to transfer the Civil Aeronautics Authority would provoke criticism and some excitement—even to a greater extent, at this particular time, than any other reorganization plan he might submit. Because he is a student of government, and has a better understanding of politics than most men, he knew that the suggestion of a change, at a time when we were rejoicing over a period of completely successful commercial aviation, would excite disapproval in some places. That is why his action was courageous.

The mere fact that there have been no fatalities in commercial aviation over a long period of time is, in my opinion, no sufficient reason why the proposed change should not be put into effect. There may be—and I am ready to believe that there is—a great need for the change; and the reasons advanced by President Roosevelt and supported by other distinguished and expert authorities convince me that the plan is sound and should be made effective.

There is no personal or political profit to the President in the proposal. As I view the matter, the only profit afforded to him, or to his administration, is the consolation and satisfaction of advancing the cause of good government through the contraction of bureaucracy and the concentration of effort and work in a more compact group. It seems to me that the plan he submits removes some of the existing confusion, offers a greater opportunity for cooperation, and effects some economy.

It seems to me that the courage and foresight of the President afford the Government and country an opportunity partially to break down the growing threat of a dictatorship of bureaucracy. More than that, and especially in this particular instance, it gives the Civil Aeronautics Authority, or the Civil Aeronautics Board, a voice at the Cabinet table, and brings this extremely important department of the Government, and likewise an important part of our national economy—the air industry—a little closer to the man whom the people of the country so overwhelmingly selected to guide and guard their business affairs.

There is, at the moment, a feeling that these vehicles of the air may become important defense weapons in our plans for national safety, and the closer we bring the activities of aviation to the head of our Government the better, I think, will we be served.

I very well remember the discussions—some of them bitter—excited by the proposals for a reorganization of the executive branch of government. I was greatly concerned about the matter, and was not completely in accord with the administration. I very well remember that some Members of Congress did not believe that much reorganization was possible, and, if I remember correctly, some of them entertained the opinion that there would be no reorganization of government under President Roosevelt. It is not hard to understand why they felt that way. Without very much trouble, I could find any number of people who could give some satisfying reasons why any and every agency of our Government should be excepted in any reorganization plan.

Reorganization Plan No. IV has excited widespread attention and provoked criticism and resistance in the instance where it affects the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Air Safety Board. I cannot easily understand the occasion for all the excitement, because I fail to find where any of the functions of this tremendously important Authority or the Board would be curtailed. I think the excitement has been artificially stimulated. Members of the Air Safety Board were appointed by the President; and I completely set aside as unworthy of serious consideration the contention that other men charged with carrying out the same functions will be less faithful to their trust, or to a greater degree subject to the pressure of politics or any outside influence. I choose to believe that men charged with the almost-sacred responsibility of protecting the courageous pilots who daily travel the airways, and their passengers, will be honest and faithful to the duty assigned to them.

In my opinion, it is unfair to take advantage of a successful record of commercial aviation to oppose a change intended to provide greater safety. I prefer to believe that the record of safety and success in the late months and years has been largely due to the inventive genius exercised in the manufacture of airplanes, and in the better training and broadened experience of pilots and others engaged in the aviation industry. While the record in commercial aviation has lately been perfect, the experience of the flyers in the Army, engaged in more hazardous flying, has likewise been good. No later than a day or two ago I discussed this particular matter with flying Army officers.

Mr. President, there is one very unfortunate circumstance surrounding the debate on this subject. There will be accidents; it is inevitable that there will now and then be a serious accident, and it is within the realm of possibility that it will come today or tomorrow. Within a period of a few weeks we read of a railroad tragedy costing the lives of many people, and that accident followed a long-time period of safe operation on the road on which the catastrophe happened. If the President's plan should be adopted, and an accident should occur, it would be especially unfortunate for him, and for those of us now supporting his views, because this discussion will focus attention upon any such accident and will magnify everything about it.

The idea of a reorganization affecting the Civil Aeronautics Authority is not very new. During the discussion of the reorganization bill in 1939 several Senators anticipated such a change if the reorganization bill should be passed. Last evening I took occasion to refer to that debate, and I quote one brief statement made by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], as follows:

Because of the President's interest in this particular agency it is my personal opinion that he has not in his mind now any idea of disturbing it; but I hope that when he investigates it, when he makes a survey, when he finds what the Appropriations Committee has found, he will give consideration to it, because of my firm conviction that something must be done about it, and that the President must do something to bring about greater accord in the administration of the act in which the Senator from Nevada has been so greatly interested.

I should like now to remind Senators, Mr. President, that that statement, made by the junior Senator from South Carolina, was made under different circumstances and conditions than now exist. It was made at a time when the junior Senator from South Carolina himself said that he doubted that the President had in mind any change in this instance. Let me emphasize the fact that the junior Senator from South Carolina then also said, a year or more ago, without any thought of this proposed change, that he felt, as a result of his experience as an active member of the Appropriations Committee, that such a change was sorely needed. It seems to me that particular situation becomes important now as we consider something which then was not anticipated.

At that time the distinguished and very able and patriotic Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who has contributed so much to aviation in America and so much in many other fields, proposed that the Civil Aeronautics Authority be excluded from the reorganization bill. His amendment was rejected—and rejected in spite of the fact that all Members of the Senate have an extremely high regard and warm admiration for the junior Senator from Nevada, as well as an understanding of his knowledge of aviation and of his contributions to its advancement.

Mr. President, in the discussion of any controversial issue there is certain to be misconception and misunderstanding. Sometimes a bit of it is purposely inspired, but more frequently, and to a greater degree, the misunderstanding arises from a lack of knowledge of the facts involved. I confess that I do not approach a discussion of this subject as an expert on aviation but rather as a student of government, as one anxious to reduce rather than build up bureaucracy, and as one convinced that this particular reorganization proposal would deliver the many problems of aviation into good hands.

The present Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Edward J. Noble, who has been for some time acting as Secretary of Commerce, is himself a graduate student of aviation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Connecticut said about the distinguished Under Secretary of Commerce, and I agree with all the encomiums which he has passed upon him. Does the Senator from Connecticut know whether or not the Under Secretary of Commerce is in favor of this change? It seems to me to be very significant that the very able and astute chairman of the Select Committee on Government Organization, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], was careful in summoning the witnesses to appear before his committee in the 2 days' hearing not to include the name of the Secretary of Commerce himself or of the Under Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MALONEY. I seriously doubt that I have a right to speak for the Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Noble, but I think that I may very safely say that he is not only in favor of the change but is anxious to see it brought about.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator give some intimation to the Senate as to the basis upon which he makes his last statement?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I will be pleased to do so. Excited by the militant and aggressive and able effort and argument of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I spent some time going into this subject. Mr. Noble is not only a constituent of mine but a friend; and because of his particular knowledge of the subject and his long-time active interest in it, his participation in aviation as a flyer, and because of the position which he holds and the fact that he was formerly Chairman of the Authority, I naturally turned to him for his opinion, as well as to numerous others.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator says he referred the matter to Mr. Noble?

Mr. MALONEY. I discussed the matter with him.

Mr. McCARRAN. And on that basis the Senator states to the Senate that Mr. Noble favors this proposed change?

Mr. MALONEY. On my own responsibility. I have not asked his permission to say that, and I endeavored to reply fairly to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator does say now that Mr. Noble, the Under Secretary of Commerce, favors this change from the present conditions?

Mr. MALONEY. I say it on my own responsibility. I assume the responsibility of saying that, in my judgment, Mr. Noble favors the change.

Mr. McCARRAN. So long as the Senator puts the matter in that way, it is all right.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Noble formerly served as chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and is a flyer, and one of America's outstanding businessmen. The subject of aviation is close to his heart; and what I say of him I could almost say about the present Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, Mr. Hinckley.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say, so far as Mr. Hinckley is concerned, that nobody has greater respect for the work he has accomplished than I have. As a matter of fact, I entertain a very deep personal affection for him; but if Mr. Hinckley is in favor of this transfer, as he indicated before the Byrnes committee the other day, I can say of my own knowledge that he was not in favor of it the day before he visited the White House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator, following his example of a few moments ago about Mr. Noble, that not only was Mr. Hinckley not in favor of the transfer, but in his expressions in my office in the Senate Office Building he was very much and openly opposed to this entire change. I say that, using the same tactics that the able Senator uses with reference to Mr. Noble.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think the Senator quite means that I am using any kind of tactics in reference to Mr. Noble.

Mr. McCARRAN. Except that when I asked the able Senator whether it was Mr. Noble's view that the change should be brought about, I remember the Senator said he answered on his own responsibility.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am answering on my responsibility.

Mr. MALONEY. I am quite certain that what the Senator from Nevada says is true, but I can also quite understand how even an authority on the subject might change his mind. I am not qualified to speak for Mr. Hinckley. I scarcely know him. I am only familiar with his record in the field of aviation, and I have not at any time discussed with him his views on this subject.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, just one more interruption, please. Will the Senator bear with me again?

Mr. MALONEY. I will; yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator that one of the most cogent expressions Mr. Hinckley made before the Committee on Reorganization on last Saturday was that the Safety Board had furnished a pattern of safety in aviation that would be followed for many years to come.

Mr. MALONEY. I may say to the Senator that that may be true without any detriment to this particular proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the same connection, Mr. Hinckley followed that statement with the further statement that the Civil Aeronautics Board, to which all the functions of the Air Safety Board are to be transferred, not only could but would carry out the pattern and improve it wherever necessary, and

as the development of the aviation industry made it necessary and justified it.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, the Senator from Kentucky knows that the life of the Civil Aeronautics Authority has been parallel with that of the Air Safety Board, and while there has been an effort on the part of the proponents of the so-called McCarran amendment to demonstrate that the splendid record of safety which has been attained is entirely due to the Air Safety Board, we cannot entirely forget the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, existing at the same time and with the actual authority to put into effect safety measures, in my judgment to a much greater extent than the Air Safety Board, has been responsible for the splendid record commercial aviation has enjoyed. In saying that, I do not for a moment want to detract from the remarkable record and fine experience of the Air Safety Board.

Mr. President, when interrupted—and I was pleased to have the interruption—I was referring to Mr. Hinckley. I should like now to take up the subject there, and say that a discussion of his interest in aviation and of his contributions to aviation might fill a book; but because there is a limitation of time in this debate, and because so many Senators are anxious to discuss the matter, I am compelled to limit my remarks.

The pressure of other congressional duties—and every Senator knows that they are very pressing—has kept me from knowing all the details of the matter under discussion; but I am impressed with the fact, or what seems to me to be a fact, that misinformation on the subject has been widespread. I have talked with some of the fine young men who came to Washington as representatives of the commercial Pilots of America, and I have talked with members of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and with Army officers, and with Members of Congress opposed to the plan, and I am finally convinced that we should support the President's proposal.

It is unfortunate that the proposed change has played upon men's emotions. The ghost of fear has been injected into the discussion over a period of weeks—and when I say that I do not intend anyone to understand that I think it has been done other than with honest intention—but catch phrases dealing with life and death take hold of the public very easily, and attempts to dissipate catch phrases and the fevers excited by them are not easily set aside by fact or reason. Recognizing that, it is important that we calmly review the importance of the question involved, and that we endeavor to understand the motives and the objectives and the merits found in the proposed reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. We must understand them if we are to be completely fair to the hundreds of thousands of persons who fly in airplanes, whether they be on the regular commercial air lines of our country, or on nonscheduled flights. In full fairness to the vitally concerned and affected American public who share our interest in the continuing successful development of civil aviation, we must be calm and fair. For the sake of the pilots who cross our country by air, we must endeavor to make clear the motives and the objectives and the merits of the change proposed. We also owe that to the aviation industry, which, as we measure time, is a new, although extremely important, part of our national economy. To just as great an extent we must make this matter clear if we are to be fair to the Government, which, after all, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging and protecting the industry in such a manner as will best affect the public welfare.

It has seemed to me sadly ironic that some of the distinguished men who have made protest in this controversy—although doing so with noble intention and the sincere desire to promote the continuing progress of civil aeronautics—may, at least to a slight degree, hinder the advancement of aviation and this great air industry. I am, at this point, referring to the charge made that if Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV are adopted, the splendid record of safety which has been established through painstaking years of trial and error will be destroyed. I do not want to make the charge that that statement is ridiculous, but I do insist that no single person or group of persons monopolizes a

desire to make flying safe, any more than any one person or group of persons monopolizes the determination to keep our country out of war.

I do not mean to imply that exciting this fear is a charge that the President, or the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, or those of us supporting the reorganization proposal, are indifferent to the safety of those who fly. It is true, however, that some persons out over the country may finally entertain such a thought, so, in effect, the patriotism of certain public officials is actually questioned. I think that view may be at least partially destroyed by reminding my listeners and other persons interested in this subject that among those who are supporting the plan are long-time intense enthusiasts of aviation. I seem to remember that President Roosevelt made a historic flight to Chicago in uncertain weather, and I am mindful of the fact that members of his family are constant patrons of the airways, and that Mr. Noble and Mr. Hinckley have long been devoted to the advancement of aviation. Thus, to imply that President Roosevelt would carelessly impede the progress of aviation is unfortunate. His administration has contributed much to the successes which aviation has enjoyed in recent years. I point out that no one who has taken the time and trouble to study the existing set-up of the Civil Aeronautics Authority can fail to recognize that administrative changes are necessary if the Authority is to continue to function effectively.

May I briefly examine the proposal in part?

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 created three autonomous groups in one agency, namely, the five members of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Administrator, and the Air Safety Board. Although Congress intended to make a sharp definition in authority and function between the three groups, that intent was not carried into actuality by the law which we finally passed. It is no longer a secret to those who have to any extent investigated the matter that there has been friction in the agency. This friction unnecessarily complicated the difficult work confronting the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and it seems to me, Mr. President, that Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV promise an erasure of the confusion created by the failure of the law carefully to define and firmly to fix responsibility and authority.

I said earlier, and I now repeat, that this reorganization proposal was not created by hurried judgment. The conduct and operation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority had been painstakingly reviewed and examined by the Bureau of the Budget. I am told that that Bureau spent 5 months on the task, and, in addition to that, that President Roosevelt had the benefit of the experience of the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I say again that one of the men best qualified to speak on the merits of the proposed change is the distinguished Chairman of the Authority, Mr. Robert Hinckley. He has probably lived as close to the subject as has any man in America, and, in commenting upon the President's proposal, he said:

I think the changed set-up is a great step forward, and I do not get excited about all this talk about aviation having received a step backward.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator quoting from the hearings?

Mr. MALONEY. I am quoting from a statement made by Mr. Hinckley prior to the hearings.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not from the official hearings?

Mr. MALONEY. From a statement made prior to the hearings.

Mr. McCARRAN. So many statements have been made by Mr. Hinckley that I was wondering which one the Senator was quoting.

Mr. MALONEY. I read the one I was quoting.

Mr. McCARRAN. I knew the Senator could not be quoting from the hearings, because I have a report of the hearings before me. But let me say that Mr. Hinckley has denounced this proposed change very vehemently, not only to me but to

others. So my quotation may be just as effective as is the Senator's.

Mr. MALONEY. I have attempted to dispute nothing which the Senator attributes to any other man. I am certain the Senator is accurate when he does so.

The judgment and the expressed opinion of Mr. Hinckley has great weight with me, because it is founded on experience and a devotion to aviation. He has lived with the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the problems of civil aviation, as Chairman of the Authority, for the past year. For a long time before that, actually for many years, he was vitally interested in aviation and was one of the first patrons of commercial flying. He has closely watched aviation grow up.

In addition to redefining authority the reorganization proposal does away with the Air Safety Board. That, more than anything else, provoked the existing disturbance; and so, at this point, I should like to say again, by way of emphasis, that the reorganization suggested does not abolish the functions of the Air Safety Board—the particular function of which is to investigate accidents. The actual and only effect of the proposal, as I see it, is to abolish or abandon three titled positions. The investigation of accidents will continue as heretofore and, in my judgment, will continue with efficiency and with complete indifference to politics and pressure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator will tell me if it annoys or disturbs him to be interrupted.

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all; I am pleased to be interrupted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the very condition to which he refers—namely, the condition in connection with investigating as to safety and as to accidents—was a function of the old Bureau of Air Commerce, and in every instance it resulted in whitewashing, because the rules and regulations were promulgated by that very agency, and the safety devices were under the control of that very agency. Of course, the agency was not going to lay the blame upon itself or upon one of its members. It is proposed that we put the five-man board right back again where the old safety board was, under the former regime.

One further interruption, and then I shall not disturb the Senator again.

Mr. MALONEY. Please let me say to the Senator that I have no objection to his interruptions. I appreciate that he is an authority on this subject, and I am glad to have his opinion.

Mr. McCARRAN. I want the Senator to set himself right in this matter. Before we set up the Civil Aeronautics Authority aviation had not only one member in the Cabinet, it had two members in the Cabinet. It had the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Commerce. I want the Senator to keep that thought in mind. Now it is proposed that this activity be put back under the Department of Commerce, in which all the present chaos arose.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the Senator's interruption at this particular time, because I think I understand the views of the junior Senator from Nevada. I think I appreciate as much as does any other Member of the Senate his devotion to aviation, and I have referred to that in my brief remarks. But, in my opinion, his comparison is, unintentionally, hardly fair, and I shall attempt, in the few moments more I shall take, so to prove.

Mr. President, I have not gone very deeply into the matter, but I know enough about the situation to know that friction has for some time existed within the Air Safety Board. I am advised, and am rather astounded to learn, that on no occasion, while the three members of the Board were in office, did they submit a unanimous report on an investigation of any accident. That seems quite serious to me, and, incidentally, seems quite unnecessary.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss briefly the final broad phase of the reorganization plan—the matter of a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. A feeling exists in some places, and in the minds of

some men, that under the Department of Commerce the Civil Aeronautics Authority officials would lose their identity. We have the word of the Attorney General that the officials charged with the guiding and guarding of aviation would be completely independent, and I think that most Members of this body are now satisfied that they would be independent. If that is true, I fail to understand the reasons for the excitement. If it is untrue, I should like to have someone undertake to tell us how or where the independence would be lost or destroyed.

Members of the Senate have read the statements of President Roosevelt, and the exchange of correspondence between the Bureau of the Budget, and Mr. Hinckley. These statements and this exchange of correspondence satisfy me that the independence of the aviation authority is properly protected and established under this reorganization proposal. To me it seems careless to insist that the fine safety record of commercial aviation will be endangered or destroyed by a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Department of Commerce. No one would take away from the Civil Aeronautics Authority, or the Air Safety Board, any of the credit which they so richly deserve, but I cannot give them all of the credit for the fine air record of commercial aviation during the past year.

I cannot forget that when control of our commercial flying was under the direction of the old Bureau of Air Commerce, in the Department of Commerce, aviation, as compared with this day, was just out of its infancy. I cannot forget that the control which the Bureau of Air Commerce then exercised was a limited control. There were many more fatalities in aviation then than now, as has always been the case with the creation of new methods of transportation. It would not have been fair, or at least reasonable, to expect that the early days of transportation by air would be free from the tragedy of accident. Accidents and fatalities were the terrific price we paid for the splendid aviation facilities of today.

I should like to remind my fellow Senators that the old Bureau of Air Commerce was without authority to impose very complete regulation upon the air lines. It was without authority to stop practices born of competition between air lines, when such competition might have in some instances resulted in the neglect of the fundamental principles of safety. The Bureau of Air Commerce of that period was without authority to issue certificates of convenience and necessity by which it could effectively act on the side of safety. The planes of that period were without ever so many of the items of safety equipment that are now available—adequately trained pilots were not so numerous as they are today and airports were fewer in number and less sufficient in quality and facilities than they are now. The use of radio to guide pilots had not then been developed to the effective standard of this year, and the inventive genius of airplane designers and those who labored in the research laboratories of the country had not yet discovered or invented much of the protective airplane equipment we now have. Weather reporting and aeronautical charting were not so extensive or so valuable as they are now. Briefly, during those years when the Bureau of Air Commerce was endeavoring to assist an infant industry in its development we were actually in the middle ages, or the dark era, of aviation.

Under all these circumstances, Mr. President, it is not entirely fair to place the blame for the numerous accidents which then occurred entirely upon the men who served upon or in the Bureau of Air Commerce. I presume that there were mistakes then, and probably more mistakes—yes; many more mistakes—than in these later days, but I desire to point out that those officials were under a more serious handicap than we are now likely quickly to realize. It was out of the experiences of those days and out of the experiences of the officials who directed that Bureau that the framework for the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was drawn. It is out of the experience of the 1938 act that President Roosevelt has now submitted a reorganization plan which is intended to advance our present splendid position in aviation. It seems to me that there are good reasons for the change, and it further seems to me, Mr. President, that we may be applying the

brakes on the progress of civil aviation if we refuse to heed the suggestion and advice of those more closely associated with the subject than we are.

May I say, again, that through a transfer of the Civil Aeronautics to the Department of Commerce, we will go forward, and by this proposed change we will more firmly establish the Federal program for Civil Aeronautics in the household of the Federal Government. The vital reporting services of the Weather Bureau, the experimental testing activities of the Bureau of Standards, and the air navigating charting work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, are in the Department of Commerce and thus close at hand. It seems to me that there is economy and a chance for a greater efficiency in the proposal. It seems to me that the plan will do away with a duplication of activities and will save money.

I have about concluded, but I wish to say again—and I think this is of extreme importance—that this change will give this very important agency of the Federal Government a place at the Cabinet board. I repeat, in a world greatly disturbed by war, we cannot overlook the fact that the change may be advantageously important to our national defense. I am very hopeful that the President's position will be sustained, and his plan approved. I repeat, he has acted with his customary courage, and those who have long sought a reorganization in Government should be mindful of this further service he renders his country.

Mr. TRUMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Sheppard
Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Shipstead
Ashurst	Frazier	Lucas	Slattery
Austin	George	Lundeen	Smathers
Bailey	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridget	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holman	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is that if there be no further debate, automatically the House Concurrent Resolution 60 comes to a vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Do I understand that the Senator from South Carolina is not going to use his time?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there is no agreement by which we have time.

Mr. McCARRAN. There was an agreement to vote at the end of the debate of 8 hours. I tried to get an agreement for a definite hour at which to vote, and now I shall ask again that the vote on this matter take place at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I ask the leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to propound the request for unanimous consent on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to voting at 4 o'clock tomorrow, provided we proceed long enough this afternoon to consume some more time. I would not want

to make any request of that sort now based upon the idea that we quit now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for the purpose of enabling me to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think we may safely assume that there are a number of other speeches to be made on both sides of this question. Inasmuch as under the statute drafted by the Senator from South Carolina himself the time is to be equally divided, it seems to me that fair play would indicate that the time be used with something like equality, so that neither side would be compelled to carry forward the burden of the debate with the purpose of piling up a large residuum on the other side at the end of the debate. As I understand, that is the suggestion which the Senator from Nevada is making. In other words, the Senator from Nevada has occupied the floor for—I do not know exactly what the time was, but perhaps an hour and a half. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] occupied the floor on the other side for a few minutes. Of course, the Senator from South Carolina, if he so desires and thinks it is in accordance with the spirit of his own statute, can remain in his seat, and compel the proponents of the McCarran resolution possibly to exhaust their time, and then at the end of it to come in with a number of speeches on the other side, because at the end of 4 hours of debate in behalf of the concurrent resolution the time of the proponents would be exhausted.

It seems to me that all ordinary standards of fairness in debate should indicate that the time should be more or less equalized as the debate goes forward. Does not the Senator from Kentucky, from his long experience, think that is a fair proposal?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no ironclad rule about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no rule at all about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, that is customary. Of course, the Senator realizes the difficulty under which we now labor, and have labored for several days, in regard to the attendance of Senators and the interest of the Senate in what is going on. I do not know who is to speak on either side. I hope to make a few brief remarks, but I do not wish to do so today. I do not think I should be expected to do so today. Aside from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and myself, I do not know of any other Senator who intends to speak on that side of the question, although there may be others. Naturally, I would not know who is to speak on the other side, so it is a matter which it is not easy to dispose of merely by wishing. I do not desire to agree now to vote at 4 o'clock tomorrow on the assumption that we are to quit work now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky willing to submit a unanimous-consent request along the lines suggested when we first met today, providing for a division of time on the subject, one-half the time to be controlled by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the other half by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], all the time which has been used today to be charged against the respective sides? Such an agreement would have the effect of concluding the debate on the subject tomorrow afternoon at approximately 4 o'clock, or shortly thereafter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I made such a request earlier in the day and it was objected to. I was told privately by one Senator that he would not agree to having one-half the time for debate controlled by one Senator and the other half by another Senator. He was unwilling to make that sort of agreement. When I know I cannot obtain an agreement, I do not see any use in putting the request. The request which I made was in accordance with what I consider to be the spirit of the law dividing the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is the spirit of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Otherwise any Senator, if he wished, could obtain the floor and occupy half the time, without any other Senator being given an opportunity to speak. I do not think that is the spirit of the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, along the same line, any Senator could occupy all the time of his side at one session, and the other side would have all the remaining time. That seems to be the attitude.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. First, in response to what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has said, I cannot claim authorship of the provision in the law. The Senator from Missouri will recall that it was written in the House and came to the Senate. I heartily agree with him that the spirit of the law must be as he suggests. It is House practice. That is the explanation of it.

It was entirely agreeable to me to have the Senate agree to the proposal of the Senator from Nevada that half the time should be allotted by the Senator from Nevada and the other half by me. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I have no intention to take up half the time on the side of those who are opposed to the concurrent resolution. My present intention is to consume only 15 or 20 minutes. Therefore I should not want to have any Senator gain the impression that by not offering to speak at this time my intention is later to obtain recognition and talk for 2½ hours. I have no such intention; and I should be very happy if the Senate would agree to the proposal of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I shall be glad to allot time to any Senator who desires to speak.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Kentucky again submit a unanimous-consent request to vote at 4 o'clock?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to test the matter, I shall submit the requests one at a time.

I ask unanimous consent that the time still remaining for debate on the concurrent resolution be controlled by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] in favor of the resolution and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in opposition to it, and that the time already consumed be taken into consideration in determining the respective number of hours to which each side shall be entitled from now on. It would not be fair to divide the time equally from now on, because the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has already occupied considerably more time than has been occupied by the other side.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true. I had in mind the thought which was expressed earlier in the day, that a definite hour be set at which to vote. Along that line, I again suggest that the able Senator from Kentucky ask unanimous consent to set the time for voting at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I said to the Senator, I am putting the requests one at a time. I think probably it is better to obtain an agreement for the control of the time uncomplicated by the other question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am perfectly willing to divide the time, charging the side which I represent with the time we have occupied today, the debate to end at a definite hour.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I shall object to the proposed control of the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the notice to which I referred a moment ago when I said I was advised that I could not obtain such an agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Colorado objected to the request to divide the time.

Mr. ADAMS. I objected to the control of the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct—the control of the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the day our leader on the Democratic side suggested the hour of 3 o'clock tomorrow for a final vote on the House concurrent resolution. At that time I made an objection, because I was not sure certain Members would be present. I suggested 4 o'clock as

the time for a final vote. I am still ready to enter into an agreement of that kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who is in charge of the matter as chairman of the committee, feels that 4 o'clock tomorrow, regardless of what happens for the remainder of today, will allow ample time, considering the time which has already been taken, I certainly have no objection to voting at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNES. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, regardless of any agreements heretofore made as to the limitation of debate or the reduction of the time of debate from 10 hours to 8 hours, I ask unanimous consent that not later than 4 p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote finally upon the concurrent resolution now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the unanimous-consent agreement which has just been entered into carry out the spirit of the law dividing the time, or is the division of time entirely out of the question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the statute provides that the time shall be equally divided. No method for dividing the time is provided in the statute. The present occupant of the Chair will ask each speaker as he is recognized whether he is for or against the concurrent resolution. That will be essential in determining whether or not one side consumes more than 4 hours.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that fixing the time for a vote tomorrow has no effect whatever on the provision of the statute dividing the time equally between the two sides.

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the benefit of the RECORD, the Senator from North Carolina will state whether he is for or against the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I shall speak against the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator for the concurrent resolution or against it?

Mr. BAILEY. I am against the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does one who is against the concurrent resolution favor the McCarran proposal?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the purpose of this debate the time is divided between those for and those against the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I may have misunderstood the Senator from North Carolina. I understood him to say that he intended to address the Senate in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. IV.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I am speaking against the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV. I take it the concurrent resolution is what is before us.

Mr. President, I shall speak mainly for the purpose of explaining my vote. It is my judgment that upon a proper consideration of the status of this matter, Senators will feel compelled to vote against the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV.

I should like to be heard by the Senate on this subject. We must consider it, Mr. President, in the light of the status created by order No. III. If we consider this situation in the light of that order, we will be driven to two conclusions, which I undertake to maintain here.

The first is that to vote for the pending concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. IV, and leaving No. III undisturbed, will have the consequence of practically

destroying the Civil Aeronautics Board; that Board will become *functus officio*. If Senators wish to do that, let them do it, but that will be the clear effect, and I intend to show it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question there?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Before the able Senator proceeds, appreciating his analytical ability, I hope he will discuss the question from the standpoint that order No. III rearranges from within, keeping the Civil Aeronautics Authority independent, while order No. IV takes away the independence of the Authority and puts it into a separate organization.

Mr. BAILEY. I intend to discuss the effect of order No. III, and I hope I may state its consequences fairly and clearly. But my second proposition is that to vote to disapprove order No. IV, leaving order No. III undisturbed, is to constitute Mr. Hester, the present Administrator, the undisputed czar of civil aeronautics in the United States; and I am opposed to that.

Those are my propositions. I came by way of these conclusions from reading the orders and reading the law of 1938 and by experience on the Commerce Committee in the period during which I have been a member of it, now 9 or 10 years.

In the first place, let us look at order No. III, and see what its consequences are, and, while looking at order No. III, let us see what the President had in mind.

In his message on the third plan of Government reorganization, filed with us on April 2, 1940, the President said:

I propose to clarify the relations of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the five-member Board of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

It was a clarification procedure.

The Administrator is made the chief administrative officer of the Authority with respect to all functions—

Note the all-embracing character of it—"all functions"—other than those relating to economic regulation and certain other activities primarily of a rule-making and adjudicative character which are entrusted to the Board.

That is all the power the Board would have.

This will eliminate the confusion of responsibilities existing under the Civil Aeronautics Act and provide a more clear-cut and effective plan of organization for the agency.

That is the President's motive; that is what he had in mind; and, in pursuance of that plan, in the same message of April 2, on page 7 of the printed pamphlet under the title of "Civil Aeronautics Authority"—and bear in mind this is plan No. III, which is not disturbed by the pending concurrent resolution—the President ordered:

Sec. 7. Functions of the Administrator transferred.—The functions vested in the Civil Aeronautics Authority by the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; the functions of aircraft registration and of safety regulation described in titles V and VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, except the functions of prescribing safety standards, rules, and regulations and of suspending and revoking certificates after hearing—

There are the only exceptions—

the function provided for by section 1101 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; and the functions of appointing such officers and employees and of authorizing such expenditures and travel as may be necessary for the performance of all functions vested in the Administrator, are transferred from the Civil Aeronautics Authority to and shall be exercised by the Administrator, who shall hereafter be known as the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

That order takes from the Board of Civil Aeronautics, headed by Mr. Hinckley, to which great honor has been paid here and to which the President has paid great honor, practically every function except the function of prescribing safety standards, rules, and regulations, and of suspending and revoking certificates after hearing. All the other functions are done away with at one stroke. Where do they go? They go to the Administrator, Mr. Hester. Are Senators ready for that? All the other functions go to him uncontrolled and unrestrained. No Cabinet officer is over him. He is a bureau and an authority all in himself; he has no board to guide him or department of the Government to direct him; he stands there, single and alone, with immense

power. So I have been amazed that such attacks as have been leveled here have not been made upon order No. III, and I am only saying that we must sustain order No. IV in order to save civil aeronautics activities from the consequences of order No. III.

Mr. President, this is a matter of the very gravest importance to this country. We are dealing with an activity the potentialities and possibilities of which are unimaginable. I should say that it is not unlikely that in a short time the principal transportation of passengers in this country will be in the air; and I would not be charged now with overstating it. I should say that a great portion of the mails and express and smaller articles of freight are not unlikely in a few years to be carried over our heads rather than on the rails or the road. There are many who would sustain me in that position. Our Government is dealing with this great industry in the presence of its first flush of activity and growth, and what we have to do about it is of inestimable importance.

Not only so, Mr. President, but civil aeronautics has a direct relation to military aeronautics, and we are just now beginning to realize, from tragic events across the Atlantic, that it may be we will discover, to our dismay and consternation, that from this time on wars are likely to be won from the air. We heard the Prime Minister of Great Britain explain in the Commons just a few days ago, in a desperate hour, that Great Britain had found it necessary to withdraw her ships and men from the shores of Norway because the Germans had superiority in the air. Civil aeronautics builds the plants. Civil aeronautics builds everything in an airship except the guns and the armament. Without a proper development of civil aeronautics, neither the Army nor the Navy will be in position to produce the ships of the air which we may find indispensable in the hour of crisis.

So again I undertake to impress upon the Senate the importance of this matter by saying that what we do about this resolution will have a direct effect upon the whole transportation outlook in our country, and also upon the whole outlook for our national defense. We cannot afford to make mistakes even for the next 6 months.

In that connection I wish to call attention to some statistics in the United States News for May 17, showing the comparison of pilots, ground crews, anti-aircraft guns, and production capacity as between the United States and Germany.

Where we in the United States have two pilots, Germany has seven and a half. The ratio of pilots—and they are as indispensable as guns and machines—is seven and a half to two.

In ground crews, where we have one and a half, Germany has nine. She outranks us in the men who maintain the ships and attend them in the ratio of nine to one and a half.

In anti-aircraft guns, for every one we have in this country—and we have only enough to protect one city, 300—Germany has 7; 7 to 1.

In production of aircraft, for every aircraft we are able to produce, Germany can produce 6—6 to 1, and 7 to 1, and 9 to 1.

And at the root of the production of aircraft and of pilots lies civil aeronautics.

So, Mr. President, if we have had an important matter before us this year, I think it can be said that no matter has outranked in importance this one.

Returning to my proposition, let the order of the President as to plan No. III stand, and we commit to Mr. Hester all of this, including the training of pilots. We are now training them all over this country. It is in contemplation that we shall shortly have 15,000 of our boys training to be pilots in our schools and colleges. I should not like to make the mistake of saying how many we have, because I do not know, but I think it is safe to say that at least 8,000 young men are now training as pilots under this Board; but order No. III turns it all over at one stroke to Mr. Hester.

Who is Mr. Hester?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator announced, when he started to speak, that he was against the resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. I am. I am speaking now against order No. III. There are two plans here, and I am going to speak for order No. IV as being indispensable to preserve this authority in view of the plain legal consequences, the inevitable consequences of order No. III.

I asked who is Mr. Hester? I have not the remotest intention of calling in question his character or his reputation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Plan No. III is law.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. Plan No. III is not law. Plan No. III will be law if we do not condemn it within 60 days from April 2.

Who is Mr. Hester? I was saying that I have no thought of reflecting on him. Sitting on the Finance Committee of the Senate, I have had frequent contacts with him. Sitting in the hearings on the Alcohol Control Act, I had contacts with him. I have no prejudice against him, and I should not think of saying here anything to his detriment; but I do say that he has never had a particle of experience in aeronautics, and all he knows about it is what he learned since he was made Administrator after the law passed in 1938.

Here is his record: He was born in Iowa, and his legal voting address is Montana. He attended George Washington University and received the A. B. degree. He also has an LL. D. from Georgetown University. Mr. Hester was a private in overseas service during the World War. His 20 years of Government career service include the following:

Law clerk, Emergency Fleet Corporation; junior attorney, Department of the Interior; assistant counsel, United States Shipping Board; counsel, office of the Alien Property Custodian; special assistant to the Attorney General; chief attorney, Department of Justice; assistant general counsel, Treasury Department; Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The last connection is the only connection he has ever had with civil aeronautics.

We will grant that Mr. Hester is a good lawyer. We will grant that he has done well in the Government service. He has risen. We will grant that he is a pretty good tax adviser; but under order No. III we are asked to place him in control of the training of pilots of all the airways, without anyone over him. I say that is asking too much of me. I say that must be corrected, and the only way before me to correct it is to correct it by order No. IV; and I sometimes think that is why the President sent order No. IV to the Congress.

Let us see whom Mr. Hester displaces. The Board of Civil Aeronautics is constituted of very excellent men. The nomination of every one of them came before the Committee on Commerce for confirmation, and it was not a formality. We examined them in the subcommittee with the utmost care. Some of them remained with us fully 2 or 3 hours; and it was disclosed to me, not only in those hearings but also by frequent personal contacts, that in Mr. Hinckley the President had discovered probably the very best man in America to look after civil aeronautics, a man of scholarship and of character and business experience, and who was a pioneer in civil aeronautics in this country. He was the founder and the organizer of the Utah-Pacific Lines, which proved a great success, and showed the way to many another development in this country. It would be a calamity to take these functions away from Mr. Hinckley, who is an expert, and place them in the hands of Mr. Hester, who could not possibly qualify as an expert except upon his experience as Administrator during the past 18 months; and yet that is the consequence of plan No. III.

Plan No. IV undertakes to correct that. I shall proceed to read the order for plan No. IV. I read from Reorganization Plan No. IV, as found on page 7, section 7:

Transfer of Civil Aeronautics Authority. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Authority and its functions, the office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and its functions, and the functions of the Air Safety Board are transferred to the Department of Commerce.

That was a necessity, in order to place a head and control over the one man to whom plan No. III had committed the whole business. I am for it. I would not wish to turn one

man loose with this great, new industry without anyone over him, even in quiet times, even when there is a stabilization, but heaven knows we cannot afford to do it now, when any mistake will amount to a blunder, and perhaps to a disaster.

(b) The functions of the Air Safety Board are consolidated with the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which shall hereafter be known as the Civil Aeronautics Board and which shall, in addition to its other functions, discharge the duties heretofore vested in the Air Safety Board so as to provide for the independent investigation of aircraft accidents. The offices of the members of the Air Safety Board are abolished.

Senators, that is a necessity. The President had to find something for the Civil Aeronautics Board to do. He had taken everything which they had to do away from them, and given it to Mr. Hester, and in order that they might not be *functus officio* he gives them this safety function, and I think they are capable of performing it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The testimony before the committee, I think, revealed the fact that if plan No. III became effective, and plan No. IV were nullified, the Administrator, whether it were Mr. Hester or someone else, would spend approximately 93 percent of all the money appropriated for the Administration.

Mr. BAILEY. That is in corroboration of my position. I say that it would make him the czar of the activity.

My second point was that since the Board of Civil Aeronautics had, by plan No. III, been stripped of all its functions, it was necessary for it to get something to do, and it was given the air-safety function. I do not object to that; I think it is a good thing. I do not think we need three wheels on this cart. So I shall vote for that. I am voting to give the activity over to the Department of Commerce, because it is necessary to have some control.

(c) The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, whose functions shall be administered under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, which shall report to Congress and the President through the Secretary of Commerce, shall constitute the Civil Aeronautics Authority within the Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That the Civil Aeronautics Board shall exercise its functions of rule making (including the prescription of rules, regulations, and standards), adjudication, and investigation independently of the Secretary of Commerce.

I am agreeable to that, too. It is a quasi-judicial body, and it should be clothed with independence.

*Provided further*, That the budgeting, accounting, personnel, procurement, and related routine management functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board shall be performed under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce through such facilities as he shall designate or establish.

The consequence of No. IV is to prevent the evils and undesired consequences of No. III. It puts Mr. Hester under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. He is not under the Department of Commerce, upon the taking effect of No. III. I should like to have the Senator permit me to finish my argument. I will then answer any question he may desire to ask. I am not able to remain much longer.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was wondering whether the Senator would like to be set right.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I should like to be set right. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator probably knows that a concurrent resolution against Reorganization Plan No. III is pending.

Mr. BAILEY. I knew that. So far as I know, it has not been seriously advocated on the floor of the Senate, it has not been entertained in the House. I think that is an answer to that. When we come to No. III, I will be right there, but I have to deal with the situation as it is, and the Senator today in his argument was attacking No. IV.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator vote for a concurrent resolution against Reorganization Plan No. III?

Mr. BAILEY. I would.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then the Senator has very cogent reasons for voting against No. IV.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, no; I cannot afford to take the risk, and I do not think any other Senator can. I do not think the junior Senator from Nevada, with all his devotion to aeronautics and all his interest in this proposed legislation, can afford to take that risk. We will come to the end of the session. If the Senator's concurrent resolution respecting plan No. IV prevails, with No. III in effect, and the Board out of power, and Mr. Hinckley gone—let me finish on that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator permit one more question?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senator, and this is my last question. The Senator is undoubtedly addressing himself to the personality of Mr. Hester. I might be in accord with him, but I did not have the appointing of Mr. Hester, nor did the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator made that remark. I am trying not to deal in personalities. I am dealing with officials. I gave Mr. Hester's record, and I took pains to say nothing in derogation. I spoke of Mr. Hinckley and his record, and I exalted him for the great work he has done, with which I am quite familiar, and I exalted him for his fine experience. Speaking of each of them, I was speaking of them as officials, and not with a view to discussing personalities. I am a friend of Mr. Hester. There has never been the slightest thing between him and me. I have sat on the Finance Committee, as our leader has, and heard Mr. Hester many times, and I will say that no one on that committee ever dreamed or suspected that the time would come when we would be called upon to sustain Reorganization Plan No. III and give him absolute control and full sway, without even the check of having to report to a Cabinet officer, over all the civil aeronautics activities, including the training of pilots, which have been put on foot by the Board and Mr. Hinckley throughout the country. That is the situation. I shall vote according to the situation as it is presented to me. If I had a chance to vote against both these plans respecting civil aeronautics, I would do it; but I have not that chance, and I have to take the situation as it is.

Mr. President, I have stated the situation, and the consequences. I come to one more thought. The President has made it known through Mr. Early, I take it, who, so far as anyone can, speaks for the President, that in the event of the approval of these plans, probably in any event, he will appoint Mr. Hinckley Assistant Secretary of Commerce, with a view to having Mr. Hinckley take charge.

Mind you, Mr. President, he cannot do that if plan No. IV is disapproved, for it is plan No. IV which puts Civil Aeronautics under the Department. That is another reason why I shall vote for plan No. IV. I am driven to it by my interest in the whole subject of aeronautics, civil and military.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator yield for one more inquiry?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator realize that if plan No. IV is voted down, plan No. III will fall of its own weight?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think so at all. They are separate plans.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is impossible to make plan No. III effective if No. IV goes out.

Mr. BAILEY. If plan No. IV filed here April 11, 1940, goes out, No. III will stay in, entirely separate and independent, and the proof of that is that we have a concurrent resolution here, which came from the House, which addresses itself wholly to plan No. IV. I do not think the Senator can sustain his contention, but I will be present to hear him when he undertakes to do so. It is not possible to destroy one Presidential order by voting down an entirely different one.

Mr. McCARRAN. Excepting that No. III is inoperative, in effect, and cannot go into operation of itself.

Mr. BAILEY. I read No. III to the Senate. I would not mind taking the time to read it again, and showing the Senator that it could be operated just as well, and it would be operated wholly by Mr. Hester, as Administrator, free and independent. That is what we have before us. I would not say it would be operated well; I would not say it would be

operated successfully; but I could say that he would go on with the matter until we met next January, and then we would pass a law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, if I understand the Senator's implication, I take it he would be very glad to vote to put plan No. III and plan No. IV out of business.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator had been listening as closely as I thought he was, he would have heard me say that a few moments ago with a good deal of emphasis.

Mr. President, I have come to my final point. Mr. Early, as Secretary to the President—I will not undertake to speak further than that—announced at Hyde Park that the President intended to appoint Mr. Hinckley Assistant Secretary of Commerce, with the expectation that he would have the function of overseeing and supervising civil aeronautics. That is extremely agreeable to me.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator says he has nothing against Mr. Hester, and that so far as concerns Mr. Hester, the matter is not personal with him.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator says that Mr. Hinckley is agreeable to him. Does that not confirm the statement that it is a personal matter?

Mr. BAILEY. I think not.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, if Mr. Hinckley has charge in the Department of Commerce it is satisfactory, but if Mr. Hester has charge in the Civil Aeronautics Authority, it is not satisfactory.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator can take that view if he wishes to do so. I gave my reasons. I think I will restate them, because nothing can be lost by reiteration of the truth.

Mr. Hinckley is a man of long and successful experience in aeronautics; he is the man who has been conducting the affairs of the Authority with the greatest satisfaction. High tribute was paid here today to the fine record made by the air lines in the last 2 years. I am not going to claim all the credit for Mr. Hinckley, nor would I permit anyone to claim all the credit for Mr. Hester, nor would I stand still and see both of them together get more than 25 percent of the credit. I give the credit for the development of the industry to the men who operate the airways.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator would reduce that to 5 percent, he might get some accord.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to go a long way to agree with the Senator from Nevada, but I could not cut it down to 5 percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What has been troubling me is the charge or contention of some persons that the function of air safety can be exercised only by one little particular group. It seems to me that a function could be exercised by any group that wanted to exercise it properly. These individuals are mere humans. They will die some time or other.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may interrupt the Senator from North Carolina again, I will say in answer to the Senator from Texas that that is self-evident. The President could have removed every one of them in a twinkling of an eye, and he did remove one of them, because he was out of accord with the other two. He gave him a job piling gravel at Gravelly Point.

Mr. CONNALLY. I apprehend they will all be removed if this order is overturned.

Mr. McCARRAN. They can be removed now.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with my friend here that all men die, unfortunately, and new men carry on notwithstanding. It was said of old—

The workers die, but the work goes on.

No man is indispensable. I made no such contention. All I said was that Presidential Order No. III takes practically all the powers, except the promulgation of safety regulations, from the Civil Aeronautics Board, presided over by Mr. Hinckley; it takes the training of pilots from the Civil Aeronautics Board, presided over by Mr. Hinckley, an experienced man in the air industry, a man who has made a fine

record in Washington, a man who is here in order to do the job, and not to get a job; and places those powers in the hands of Mr. Hester, whose only record is that of a successful attorney in the bureaus at Washington.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I have been very much interested in what Senators have had to say about Presidential Order No. III and Presidential Order No. IV. I understand the position of the Senator from North Carolina is that the two orders are so inextricably bound together that they ought to stand or fall together.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator. I wish, Mr. President, that the President had sent the proposals to the Congress in one order.

Mr. BURKE. But if the Senate, in the exercise of its wisdom, should agree to the concurrent resolution disapproving Presidential Order No. IV, does the Senator from North Carolina have any doubt that the President would then withdraw order No. III? I find nothing in the statute that would inhibit that at all, and make it necessary for him to leave order No. III with us. The order does not go into effect until the 2d of June, and I would assume that the consequences of leaving order No. III in effect by itself, without order No. IV, would impress themselves upon the President as fully as they have upon the Senator from North Carolina, and as he has impressed me, and that the President would promptly see that order No. III never went into effect.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, that is highly speculative. I have heard people in this country debate and discuss for the last year what the President would do, but I have not yet found anyone who knew. [Laughter.] I am not going to assume, and I am not going to vote, on the theory of what the President will do until he tells me in unequivocal terms.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it the Senator is not referring to third terms when he speaks in that manner.

Mr. BAILEY. No; not in the remotest.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In case order No. IV is not permitted to become law, and order No. III still is the law, if it should not prove satisfactory, is it not likely that the President would issue still another order adjusting Presidential Order No. III to meet whatever conditions were necessary?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. I was about to respond to that question. If the Senator from Nevada wishes to respond first he may do so, or if he wishes to wait, I will respond now.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but I will draw the attention of the able Senator from Texas, if I may, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina, to this point. The Senator says, "still is the law." Order No. III is not in effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; but if it should go into effect, and order No. IV should be killed, that would not exhaust the President's power. He could issue another order establishing another set-up, if he desired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; he could issue as many as he liked.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether he could issue another effectual order or not. If Congress shall adjourn, as some think it may, within less than 60 days, and the President should issue an order, the order could not go into effect until the next session. The Reorganization Act expires by limitation early in January 1941.

I am unwilling, Mr. President, to proceed in this situation on theories or assumptions. I am proceeding on the simple fact that order No. III will have consequences which I do not think are good for aeronautics, or good for national defense, and that order No. IV will tend to avert those consequences, for we could, by way of confirming the appointment of Mr. Hinckley as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, restore to a position of great influence the man who I think

is entitled to more consideration at the hands of the Congress and the President than any other man in America.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD two telegrams which bear on the pending business. They were received by me within the hour.

The first is from Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, 1940.

WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We oppose transfer Food-Drug Administration by Reorganization Order No. IV from Department of Agriculture, where it has been efficiently administered for years. Farmers vigorously fought for legislation and administration by Secretary of Agriculture. Earnestly feel transfer unwise. Consequently urge you support McCarran resolution disfavoring Reorganization Order No. IV.

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,

Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

The second telegram is from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, 1940.

WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Senator, Washington, D. C.:

I have been told that the Senate will today start considering Senator McCARRAN's Concurrent Resolution No. 43, to set aside Reorganization Order No. IV, which proposes to abolish the Air Safety Board and the new Air Authority, and place the control of civil flying and air transportation back under the Department of Commerce. The American Federation of Labor, which includes as one of its affiliates the air-line pilots, heartily endorses the McCarran resolution. Since hearing about the President's latest reorganization proposal I have been deeply concerned and distressed. I have talked to many people about this and there doesn't seem to be any plausible reason for this action. The contrast between the safety record established since the Air Safety Board and new Air Authority took over, and the deplorable record of fatal crashes involving the loss of score upon score of human lives that occurred previously, is unmistakable. During the time the air industry was regulated by the Commerce Department there occurred 130 fatal air-line crashes, resulting in the death of 473 pilots and passengers. Against this stands the nonfatality world record of 1 year and 43 days, or 409 days, without a single fatality to crew or passenger since the new agencies started functioning only 20 months ago. This points definitely to the wisdom of leaving the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 status quo. If there ever was an issue that was both popular and right, this is it. In this situation the record speaks much louder than anything that could be said. The 1,450 air-line pilots that fly our air-line transport planes to the far corners of the Western Hemisphere are aroused, and they are all unanimous in the opinion that the Air Safety Board should not be abolished. When it comes to a matter of safety, the opinion of the workers, whether they toil on the ground or in the air, usually reflects the proper course to follow. The entire air industry, the air-traveling public, the press, and the public generally are unanimously for the McCarran resolution. Public opinion generally is unmistakably against Reorganization Order No. IV. In the interest of protecting our fine group of air-line pilots and their precious human cargo your support of McCARRAN's Resolution No. 43 is most earnestly and sincerely urged.

WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I suppose no other Senator wishes to address the Senate at this time. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over until the conclusion of the matter now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

## POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

## POSTMASTER, MIAMI, FLA.—GEORGE E. MERRICK

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, earlier in the day the nomination of George E. Merrick to be postmaster at Miami, Fla., was favorably reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination. My colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is in favor of the nomination, and I should like to have the matter disposed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

## MOUNT RUSHMORE MEMORIAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. From the Committee on the Library, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 8357) to amend the Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, what is the nature of the measure?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a bill amending the authority under which the monuments at Mount Rushmore are being carved by Mr. Gutzon Borglum. It authorizes the appropriation of a little additional money. The bill was passed by the House, and it is important that it pass the Senate in order that the Committee on Appropriations may consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8357) to amend the Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of April 24), 1940*

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Royd R. Sayers, of Virginia, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice John Wellington Finch, resigned.

## APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Grosvenor Francis Powell, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 1, 1935, effective July 16, 1940.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## TO BE COLONELS

Lt. Col. James Roy Newman Weaver, Infantry, from May 2, 1940.

Lt. Col. John Porter Lucas, Field Artillery, from May 2, 1940.

Lt. Col. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr., Infantry, from May 2, 1940.

## TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Charles Everett Hurdis, Field Artillery, from May 2, 1940.

Maj. Henry Hutchings, Jr., Corps of Engineers, from May 2, 1940.

Maj. Henry John Schroeder, Signal Corps, from May 2, 1940.

## TO BE MAJORS

Capt. William Robert Sweeley, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps), from May 2, 1940.

Capt. George Allan McHenry, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps), from May 2, 1940.

Capt. Seward William Hulse, Quartermaster Corps, from May 2, 1940.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of April 24), 1940*

## POSTMASTERS

## FLORIDA

George E. Merrick, Miami.

## MARYLAND

Kathryn T. Schaefer, Chesapeake City.

## MICHIGAN

Nelson Joseph Coash, Romulus.

Rex R. Royal, Shelby.

## PUERTO RICO

Christina G. Sandoval, Hato Rey.

Juan V. Hernandez, San Sebastian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and Sovereign God of the universe, we approach Thy throne with the glad assurance that they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.

May this be a day of unclouded vision for our President, for our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress, as they courageously seek to minister to the needs of our beloved country and the whole world.

Wilt Thou show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity, emancipating it forever from everything that defiles and degrades. We are praying for that glorious time when the spirit of man shall be too strong for chains and too large to allow itself to be imprisoned by selfishness, injustice, prejudice, bigotry, hatred, and all those sinister and debasing feelings and forces which are continually storming the citadel of our souls.

In the name of our Lord and Saviour, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 10, 1940, was read and approved.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to me by the Governor of New Mexico, Hon. John E. Miles, and a short speech made by him on the question of relief.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

## AMERICA'S MOTHER OF 1940

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.